

GHAJAR EXHIBIT 9

Joseph R. Saveri (State Bar No. 130064)
Cadio Zirpoli (State Bar No. 179108)
Christopher K.L. Young (State Bar No. 318371)
Holden Benon (State Bar No. 325847)
Aaron Cera (State Bar No. 351163)
Margaux Poueymirou (State Bar No. 356000)
JOSEPH SAVERI LAW FIRM, LLP
601 California Street, Suite 1505
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 500-6800
Facsimile: (415) 395-9940
Email: jsaveri@saverilawfirm.com
czirpoli@saverilawfirm.com
cyoung@saverilawfirm.com
hbenon@saverilawfirm.com
acera@saverilawfirm.com
mpoueymirou@saverilawfirm.com

Matthew Butterick (State Bar No. 250953)
1920 Hillhurst Avenue, 406
Los Angeles, CA 90027
Telephone: (323) 968-2632
Facsimile: (415) 395-9940
Email: mb@buttericklaw.com

Bryan L. Clobes (pro hac vice)
Alexander J. Sweatman (pro hac vice)
Mohammed A. Rathur (pro hac vice anticipated)
**CAFFERTY CLOBES MERIWETHER
& SPRENGEL LLP**
135 South LaSalle Street, Suite 3210
Chicago, IL 60603
Telephone: (312) 782-4880
Email: bclobes@caffertyclobes.com
asweatman@caffertyclobes.com
mrathur@caffertyclobes.com

*Counsel for Individual and Representative
Plaintiffs and the Proposed Class*

[Additional counsel on signature page]

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

Richard Kadrey, et al.,

Individual and Representative Plaintiffs,

v.

Meta Platforms, Inc.,

Defendant.

Lead Case No. 3:23-cv-03417-VC
Case No. 4:23-cv-06663

**PLAINTIFF TA-NEHISI COATES'S
AMENDED RESPONSES TO DEFENDANT
META PLATFORMS, INC.'S SECOND SET
OF REQUESTS FOR ADMISSION**

1 duplicative in whole or in part of RFAs 8-9, 11, and 13-14. Subject to and without waiving the
 2 foregoing objections, Plaintiff responds as follows: admit.

3 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 11:**

4 Admit that YOU are unaware of consent ever having been given (either by YOU or somebody
 5 so authorized on YOUR behalf) to use of any of YOUR ASSERTED WORKS as training data for
 6 artificial intelligence.

7 **AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 11:**

8 Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for
 9 discovery that is irrelevant and /or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it
 10 includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. As narrowed by the parties,
 11 Plaintiff will construe “You” and “Your” to include Plaintiff individually, and his agents. Plaintiff
 12 objects to this Request as unintelligible and vague as to the term “artificial intelligence” and will
 13 construe that term to mean generative artificial intelligence. Plaintiff further objects to this Request as
 14 duplicative in whole or in part of RFAs 8-10 and 13-14. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing
 15 objections, Plaintiff responds as follows: admit.

16 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 12:**

17 Admit that, other than YOUR contention that LLM developers such as Meta should have
 18 compensated YOU to allegedly use YOUR ASSERTED WORKS to train large language models (see,
 19 e.g., [March 7, 2024 denial of RFA No. 1], YOU are unaware of any lost sales due to the infringement
 20 alleged in the COMPLAINT.

21 **AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 12:**

22 Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for
 23 discovery that is irrelevant and /or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it
 24 includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. As narrowed by the parties,
 25 Plaintiff will construe “You” and “Your” to include Plaintiff individually, and his agents. Plaintiff
 26 objects to the term “lost sales” as vague and ambiguous. Plaintiff further objects to this Request
 27 because it is hypothetical and not tied to the facts of the case. See, e.g., *Buchanan v. Chi. Transit Auth.*,
 2016 WL 7116591, at *5 (N.D. Ill. Dec. 7, 2016) (“Since requests to admit ‘must be connected to the

facts of the case, courts do not permit “hypothetical” questions within requests for admission.”); *Fulhorst v. Un. Techs. Auto., Inc.*, 1997 WL 873548, at *3 (D. Del. Nov. 17, 1997) (denying request “asking Plaintiff to admit to infringement in the context of the hypothetical use of its device”); Fed. R. Civ. P. 36 advisory committee’s note to 1946 amendment. Plaintiff further objects to this Request as duplicative in whole or in part of RFA 15. Further, this Request seeks premature expert opinion. Plaintiffs are still investigating their damages theory. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Plaintiff responds as follows: admit.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 13:

Admit that YOU have no documentary evidence that any PERSON has offered any consideration to YOU for the use of YOUR ASSERTED WORKS to train large language models.

AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 13:

Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for discovery that is irrelevant and/or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. As narrowed by the parties, Plaintiff will construe “You” and “Your” to include Plaintiff individually, and his agents. Plaintiff also objects to the term “documentary evidence” as vague and overbroad because it is not limited to the specific claims and defenses raised in this dispute. Plaintiff further objects to this Request as duplicative in whole or in part of RFAs 8-11, and 14. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Plaintiff responds as follows: admit.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 14:

Admit that YOU have no documentary evidence that any PERSON has actually compensated YOU any consideration for use of YOUR ASSERTED WORKS to train large language models.

AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 14:

Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for discovery that is irrelevant and/or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. As narrowed by the parties, Plaintiff will construe “You” and “Your” to include Plaintiff individually, and his agents. Plaintiff also objects to the term “documentary evidence” as vague and overbroad because it is not limited to the

specific claims and defenses raised in this dispute. Plaintiff further objects to this Request as duplicative in whole or in part of RFAs 8-11, and 13. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Plaintiff responds as follows: admit.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 15:

Admit that, other than YOUR contention that LLM developers such as Meta should have compensated YOU to allegedly use YOUR ASSERTED WORKS to train large language models, YOU are unaware of any documentary evidence that YOU have lost sales of any ASSERTED WORKS due to the infringement alleged in the COMPLAINT.

AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 15:

Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for discovery that is irrelevant and/or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. As narrowed by the parties, Plaintiff will construe “You” and “Your” to include Plaintiff individually, and his agents. Plaintiff also objects to the term “documentary evidence” as being vague and overbroad because it is not limited to the specific claims and defenses raised in this case. Plaintiff further objects to the term “lost sales” as vague and ambiguous. Plaintiff also objects to this Request because it is hypothetical and not tied to the facts of the case. See, e.g., *Buchanan v. Chi. Transit Auth.*, 2016 WL 7116591, at *5 (N.D. Ill. Dec. 7, 2016) (“Since requests to admit ‘must be connected to the facts of the case, courts do not permit “hypothetical” questions within requests for admission.”); *Fulhorst v. Un. Techs. Auto., Inc.*, 1997 WL 873548, at *3 (D. Del. Nov. 17, 1997) (denying request “asking Plaintiff to admit to infringement in the context of the hypothetical use of its device”); Fed. R. Civ. P. 36 advisory committee’s note to 1946 amendment. Plaintiff further objects to this Request as duplicative in whole or in part of RFA 12. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Plaintiff responds as follows: admit.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 16:

Admit that book sales for YOUR ASSERTED WORKS (including through any physical bookstore, on-line bookseller, or any other type of book wholesaler or retailer) have not decreased due to the alleged use of YOUR ASSERTED WORKS to train large language models.

Dated: September 6, 2024

By: /s/ Bryan L. Clobes
Bryan L. Clobes

Joseph R. Saveri (State Bar No. 130064)
Cadio Zirpoli (State Bar No. 179108)
Christopher K.L. Young (State Bar No. 318371)
Holden Benon (State Bar No. 325847)
Aaron Cera (State Bar No. 351163)
Margaux Poueymirou (State Bar No. 356000)
JOSEPH SAVERI LAW FIRM, LLP
601 California Street, Suite 1505
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 500-6800
Facsimile: (415) 395-9940
Email: jsaveri@saverilawfirm.com
czirpoli@saverilawfirm.com
cyoung@saverilawfirm.com
hbenon@saverilawfirm.com
acera@saverilawfirm.com
mpoueymirou@saverilawfirm.com

Matthew Butterick (State Bar No. 250953)
1920 Hillhurst Avenue, 406
Los Angeles, CA 90027
Telephone: (323)968-2632
Facsimile: (415) 395-9940
Email: mb@buttericklaw.com

Bryan L. Clobes (*pro hac vice*)
Alexander J. Sweatman (*pro hac vice*)
Mohammed A. Rathur (*pro hac vice anticipated*)
**CAFFERTY CLOBES MERIWETHER
& SPRENGEL LLP**
135 South LaSalle Street, Suite 3210
Chicago, IL 60603
Telephone: (312) 782-4880
Email: bclobes@caffertyclobes.com
asweatman@caffertyclobes.com
mrathur@caffertyclobes.com

Daniel J. Muller (State Bar No. 193396)
VENTURA HERSEY & MULLER, LLP
1506 Hamilton Avenue
San Jose, California 95125
Telephone: (408) 512-3022
Facsimile: (408) 512-3023
Email: dmuller@venturahersey.com

*Counsel for Individual and Representative Plaintiffs
and the Proposed Class*

Joseph R. Saveri (State Bar No. 130064)
Cadio Zirpoli (State Bar No. 179108)
Christopher K.L. Young (State Bar No. 318371)
Holden Benon (State Bar No. 325847)
Aaron Cera (State Bar No. 351163)
Margaux Poueymirou (State Bar No. 356000)
JOSEPH SAVERI LAW FIRM, LLP
601 California Street, Suite 1505
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 500-6800
Facsimile: (415) 395-9940
Email: jsaveri@saverilawfirm.com
czirpoli@saverilawfirm.com
cyoung@saverilawfirm.com
hbenon@saverilawfirm.com
acera@saverilawfirm.com
mpoueymirou@saverilawfirm.com

Matthew Butterick (State Bar No. 250953)
1920 Hillhurst Avenue, 406
Los Angeles, CA 90027
Telephone: (323) 968-2632
Facsimile: (415) 395-9940
Email: mb@buttericklaw.com

Bryan L. Clobes (pro hac vice)
Alexander J. Sweatman (pro hac vice)
Mohammed A. Rathur (pro hac vice)
**CAFFERTY CLOBES MERIWETHER
& SPRENGEL LLP**
135 South LaSalle Street, Suite 3210
Chicago, IL 60603
Telephone: (312) 782-4880
Email: bclobes@caffertyclobes.com
asweatman@caffertyclobes.com
mrathur@caffertyclobes.com

*Counsel for Individual and Representative
Plaintiffs and the Proposed Class*

[Additional counsel on signature page]

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

Richard Kadrey, et al.,
Individual and Representative Plaintiffs,
v.
Meta Platforms, Inc.,
Defendant.

Lead Case No. 3:23-cv-03417-VC
Case No. 4:23-cv-06663

**PLAINTIFF TA-NEHISI COATES'S
SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSES TO
DEFENDANT META PLATFORMS, INC.'S
SECOND SET OF REQUESTS FOR
ADMISSION**

Lead Case No. 3:23-cv-03417-VC

PLAINTIFF TA-NEHISI COATES'S SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSES TO DEFENDANT META PLATFORMS, INC.'S
SECOND SET OF REQUESTS FOR ADMISSION

PROPOUNDING PARTIES: Defendant Meta Platforms, Inc.

RESPONDING PARTIES: Plaintiff Ta-Nehisi Coates

SET NUMBER: Two (2)

Plaintiff Ta-Nehisi Coates (“Plaintiff”) hereby amends his responses to Defendant Meta Platforms, Inc.’s (“Defendant” or “Meta”) Second Set of Requests for Admissions (the “Requests” or “RFAs”).

GENERAL OBJECTIONS

1. Plaintiff generally objects to Defendant’s definitions and instructions to the extent they purport to require Plaintiff to respond in any way beyond what is required by the Federal and local rules.

2. Plaintiff objects to the Requests to the extent they seek information or materials that are protected from disclosure by attorney-client privilege, the work product doctrine, expert disclosure rules, or other applicable privileges and protections, including communications with Plaintiff’s attorneys regarding the Action.

Discovery in this matter is ongoing and Plaintiff reserves the right to amend, modify, or supplement these responses with subsequently discovered responsive information and to introduce and rely upon any such subsequently discovered information in this litigation.

SUPPLEMENTAL OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO INDIVIDUAL REQUESTS

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 18:

Admit that, other than YOUR contention that LLM developers such as Meta should have compensated YOU to allegedly use YOUR ASSERTED WORKS to train large language models, YOU are unaware of any specific licensing opportunity that YOU lost due to the infringement alleged in the COMPLAINT.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 18:

Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for discovery that is irrelevant and/or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. Plaintiff will construe the

terms “You” and “Your” as referring to Plaintiff Ta-Nehisi Coates. Plaintiff objects to this Request as irrelevant to any claim or defense and disproportional to the status and needs of this case. Plaintiff objects to this Request because it is hypothetical and is not tied to the facts of the case. *See, e.g., Buchanan v. Chi. Transit Auth.*, 2016 WL 7116591, at *5 (N.D. Ill. Dec. 7, 2016) (“Since requests to admit ‘must be connected to the facts of the case, courts do not permit “hypothetical” questions within requests for admission.”); *Fulhorst v. Un. Techs. Auto., Inc.*, 1997 WL 873548, at *3 (D. Del. Nov. 17, 1997) (denying request “asking Plaintiff to admit to infringement in the context of the hypothetical use of its device”); Fed. R. Civ. P. 36 advisory committee’s note to 1946 amendment. There is no way for Plaintiff to know what his licensing opportunities would have been but for Meta’s failure to compensate, let alone other LLM developers. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Plaintiff responds that after a reasonable inquiry, the information known or that can be readily obtained by him is insufficient to enable him to admit or deny.

SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 18:

Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for discovery that is irrelevant and/or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. Plaintiff will construe the terms “You” and “Your” as referring to Plaintiff Ta-Nehisi Coates. Plaintiff objects to this Request as irrelevant to any claim or defense and disproportional to the status and needs of this case. Plaintiff objects to this Request because it is hypothetical and is not tied to the facts of the case. *See, e.g., Buchanan v. Chi. Transit Auth.*, 2016 WL 7116591, at *5 (N.D. Ill. Dec. 7, 2016) (“Since requests to admit ‘must be connected to the facts of the case, courts do not permit “hypothetical” questions within requests for admission.”); *Fulhorst v. Un. Techs. Auto., Inc.*, 1997 WL 873548, at *3 (D. Del. Nov. 17, 1997) (denying request “asking Plaintiff to admit to infringement in the context of the hypothetical use of its device”); Fed. R. Civ. P. 36 advisory committee’s note to 1946 amendment. There is no way for Plaintiff to know what his licensing opportunities would have been but for Meta’s failure to compensate, let alone other LLM developers. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Plaintiff responds, admit.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 19:

1 Dated: September 19, 2024

By: /s/ Bryan L. Clobes
Bryan L. Clobes

2
3 Joseph R. Saveri (State Bar No. 130064)
4 Cadio Zirpoli (State Bar No. 179108)
5 Christopher K.L. Young (State Bar No. 318371)
6 Holden Benon (State Bar No. 325847)
7 Aaron Cera (State Bar No. 351163)
8 Margaux Poueymirou (State Bar No. 356000)
9 **JOSEPH SAVERI LAW FIRM, LLP**
601 California Street, Suite 1505
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 500-6800
Facsimile: (415) 395-9940
Email: jsaveri@saverilawfirm.com
czirpoli@saverilawfirm.com
cyoung@saverilawfirm.com
hbenon@saverilawfirm.com
acera@saverilawfirm.com
mpoueymirou@saverilawfirm.com

11 Matthew Butterick (State Bar No. 250953)
12 1920 Hillhurst Avenue, 406
13 Los Angeles, CA 90027
14 Telephone: (323)968-2632
15 Facsimile: (415) 395-9940
16 Email: mb@buttericklaw.com

17 Bryan L. Clobes (pro hac vice)
18 Alexander J. Sweatman (pro hac vice)
19 Mohammed A. Rathur (pro hac vice anticipated)
20 **CAFFERTY CLOBES MERIWETHER**
21 **& SPRENGEL LLP**
135 South LaSalle Street, Suite 3210
Chicago, IL 60603
Telephone: (312) 782-4880
Email: bclobes@caffertyclobes.com
asweatman@caffertyclobes.com
mrathur@caffertyclobes.com

22 Daniel J. Muller (State Bar No. 193396)
23 **VENTURA HERSEY & MULLER, LLP**
1506 Hamilton Avenue
San Jose, California 95125
Telephone: (408) 512-3022
Facsimile: (408) 512-3023
Email: dmuller@venturahersey.com

25 *Counsel for Individual and Representative Plaintiffs*
26 *and the Proposed Class*
27
28

Joseph R. Saveri (State Bar No. 130064)
Cadio Zirpoli (State Bar No. 179108)
Christopher K.L. Young (State Bar No. 318371)
Holden Benon (State Bar No. 325847)
Aaron Cera (State Bar No. 351163)
Margaux Poueymirou (State Bar No. 356000)
JOSEPH SAVERI LAW FIRM, LLP
601 California Street, Suite 1505
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 500-6800
Facsimile: (415) 395-9940
Email: jsaveri@saverilawfirm.com
czirpoli@saverilawfirm.com
cyoung@saverilawfirm.com
hbenon@saverilawfirm.com
acera@saverilawfirm.com
mpoueymirou@saverilawfirm.com

Matthew Butterick (State Bar No. 250953)
1920 Hillhurst Avenue, 406
Los Angeles, CA 90027
Telephone: (323) 968-2632
Facsimile: (415) 395-9940
Email: mb@buttericklaw.com

Bryan L. Clobes (pro hac vice)
Alexander J. Sweatman (pro hac vice)
Mohammed A. Rathur (pro hac vice anticipated)
**CAFFERTY CLOBES MERIWETHER
& SPRENGEL LLP**
135 South LaSalle Street, Suite 3210
Chicago, IL 60603
Telephone: (312) 782-4880
Email: bclobes@caffertyclobes.com
asweatman@caffertyclobes.com
mrathur@caffertyclobes.com

*Counsel for Individual and Representative
Plaintiffs and the Proposed Class*

[Additional counsel on signature page]

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

Richard Kadrey, et al.,

Individual and Representative Plaintiffs,

v.

Meta Platforms, Inc.,

Defendant.

Lead Case No. 3:23-cv-03417-VC
Case No. 4:23-cv-06663

**PLAINTIFF JUNOT DIAZ'S AMENDED
RESPONSES TO DEFENDANT META
PLATFORMS, INC.'S SECOND SET OF
REQUESTS FOR ADMISSION**

1 duplicative in whole or in part of RFAs 8-9, 11, and 13-14. Subject to and without waiving the
 2 foregoing objections, Plaintiff responds as follows: admit.

3 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 11:**

4 Admit that YOU are unaware of consent ever having been given (either by YOU or somebody
 5 so authorized on YOUR behalf) to use of any of YOUR ASSERTED WORKS as training data for
 6 artificial intelligence.

7 **AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 11:**

8 Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for
 9 discovery that is irrelevant and /or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it
 10 includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. As narrowed by the parties,
 11 Plaintiff will construe “You” and “Your” to include Plaintiff individually, and his agents. Plaintiff
 12 objects to this Request as unintelligible and vague as to the term “artificial intelligence” and will
 13 construe that term to mean generative artificial intelligence. Plaintiff further objects to this Request as
 14 duplicative in whole or in part of RFAs 8-10 and 13-14. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing
 15 objections, Plaintiff responds as follows: admit.

16 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 12:**

17 Admit that, other than YOUR contention that LLM developers such as Meta should have
 18 compensated YOU to allegedly use YOUR ASSERTED WORKS to train large language models (see,
 19 e.g., [March 7, 2024 denial of RFA No. 1], YOU are unaware of any lost sales due to the infringement
 20 alleged in the COMPLAINT.

21 **AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 12:**

22 Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for
 23 discovery that is irrelevant and /or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it
 24 includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. As narrowed by the parties,
 25 Plaintiff will construe “You” and “Your” to include Plaintiff individually, and his agents. Plaintiff
 26 objects to the term “lost sales” as vague and ambiguous. Plaintiff further objects to this Request
 27 because it is hypothetical and not tied to the facts of the case. See, e.g., *Buchanan v. Chi. Transit Auth.*,
 2016 WL 7116591, at *5 (N.D. Ill. Dec. 7, 2016) (“Since requests to admit ‘must be connected to the

1 facts of the case, courts do not permit “hypothetical” questions within requests for admission.”);
2 *Fulhorst v. Un. Techs. Auto., Inc.*, 1997 WL 873548, at *3 (D. Del. Nov. 17, 1997) (denying request
3 “asking Plaintiff to admit to infringement in the context of the hypothetical use of its device”); Fed. R.
4 Civ. P. 36 advisory committee’s note to 1946 amendment. Plaintiff further objects to this Request as
5 duplicative in whole or in part of RFA 15. Further, this Request seeks premature expert opinion.
6 Plaintiffs are still investigating their damages theory. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing
7 objections, Plaintiff responds as follows: admit.

8 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 13:**

9 Admit that YOU have no documentary evidence that any PERSON has offered any
10 consideration to YOU for the use of YOUR ASSERTED WORKS to train large language models.

11 **AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 13:**

12 Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for
13 discovery that is irrelevant and/or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it
14 includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. As narrowed by the parties,
15 Plaintiff will construe “You” and “Your” to include Plaintiff individually, and his agents. Plaintiff also
16 objects to the term “documentary evidence” as vague and overbroad because it is not limited to the
17 specific claims and defenses raised in this dispute. Plaintiff further objects to this Request as
18 duplicative in whole or in part of RFAs 8-11, and 14. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing
19 objections, Plaintiff responds as follows: admit.

20 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 14:**

21 Admit that YOU have no documentary evidence that any PERSON has actually compensated
22 YOU any consideration for use of YOUR ASSERTED WORKS to train large language models.

23 **AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 14:**

24 Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for
25 discovery that is irrelevant and/or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it
26 includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. As narrowed by the parties,
27 Plaintiff will construe “You” and “Your” to include Plaintiff individually, and his agents. Plaintiff also
objects to the term “documentary evidence” as vague and overbroad because it is not limited to the

specific claims and defenses raised in this dispute. Plaintiff further objects to this Request as duplicative in whole or in part of RFAs 8-11, and 13. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Plaintiff responds as follows: admit.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 15:

Admit that, other than YOUR contention that LLM developers such as Meta should have compensated YOU to allegedly use YOUR ASSERTED WORKS to train large language models, YOU are unaware of any documentary evidence that YOU have lost sales of any ASSERTED WORKS due to the infringement alleged in the COMPLAINT.

AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 15:

Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for discovery that is irrelevant and/or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. As narrowed by the parties, Plaintiff will construe “You” and “Your” to include Plaintiff individually, and his agents. Plaintiff also objects to the term “documentary evidence” as being vague and overbroad because it is not limited to the specific claims and defenses raised in this case. Plaintiff further objects to the term “lost sales” as vague and ambiguous. Plaintiff also objects to this Request because it is hypothetical and not tied to the facts of the case. See, e.g., *Buchanan v. Chi. Transit Auth.*, 2016 WL 7116591, at *5 (N.D. Ill. Dec. 7, 2016) (“Since requests to admit ‘must be connected to the facts of the case, courts do not permit “hypothetical” questions within requests for admission.”); *Fulhorst v. Un. Techs. Auto., Inc.*, 1997 WL 873548, at *3 (D. Del. Nov. 17, 1997) (denying request “asking Plaintiff to admit to infringement in the context of the hypothetical use of its device”); Fed. R. Civ. P. 36 advisory committee’s note to 1946 amendment. Plaintiff further objects to this Request as duplicative in whole or in part of RFA 12. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Plaintiff responds as follows: admit.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 16:

Admit that book sales for YOUR ASSERTED WORKS (including through any physical bookstore, on-line bookseller, or any other type of book wholesaler or retailer) have not decreased due to the alleged use of YOUR ASSERTED WORKS to train large language models.

1 Dated: September 6, 2024

By: /s/ Bryan L. Clobes
Bryan L. Clobes

2
3 Joseph R. Saveri (State Bar No. 130064)
Cadio Zirpoli (State Bar No. 179108)
4 Christopher K.L. Young (State Bar No. 318371)
Holden Benon (State Bar No. 325847)
5 Aaron Cera (State Bar No. 351163)
Margaux Poueymirou (State Bar No. 356000)
6 **JOSEPH SAVERI LAW FIRM, LLP**
601 California Street, Suite 1505
7 San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 500-6800
8 Facsimile: (415) 395-9940
Email: jsaveri@saverilawfirm.com
9 czirpoli@saverilawfirm.com
cyoung@saverilawfirm.com
10 hbenon@saverilawfirm.com
acera@saverilawfirm.com
mpoueymirou@saverilawfirm.com

11 Matthew Butterick (State Bar No. 250953)
12 1920 Hillhurst Avenue, 406
Los Angeles, CA 90027
13 Telephone: (323)968-2632
14 Facsimile: (415) 395-9940
Email: mb@buttericklaw.com

15 Bryan L. Clobes (*pro hac vice*)
16 Alexander J. Sweatman (*pro hac vice*)
Mohammed A. Rathur (*pro hac vice anticipated*)
17 **CAFFERTY CLOBES MERIWETHER**
& SPRENGEL LLP
18 135 South LaSalle Street, Suite 3210
Chicago, IL 60603
19 Telephone: (312) 782-4880
20 Email: bclobes@caffertyclobes.com
asweatman@caffertyclobes.com
21 mrathur@caffertyclobes.com

22 Daniel J. Muller (State Bar No. 193396)
23 **VENTURA HERSEY & MULLER, LLP**
1506 Hamilton Avenue
24 San Jose, California 95125
Telephone: (408) 512-3022
25 Facsimile: (408) 512-3023
Email: dmuller@venturahersey.com

26 *Counsel for Individual and Representative Plaintiffs*
27 *and the Proposed Class*

Joseph R. Saveri (State Bar No. 130064)
Cadio Zirpoli (State Bar No. 179108)
Christopher K.L. Young (State Bar No. 318371)
Holden Benon (State Bar No. 325847)
Aaron Cera (State Bar No. 351163)
Margaux Poueymirou (State Bar No. 356000)

JOSEPH SAVERI LAW FIRM, LLP

601 California Street, Suite 1505
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 500-6800
Facsimile: (415) 395-9940
Email: jsaveri@saverilawfirm.com
czirpoli@saverilawfirm.com
cyoung@saverilawfirm.com
hbenon@saverilawfirm.com
acera@saverilawfirm.com
mpoueymirou@saverilawfirm.com

Matthew Butterick (State Bar No. 250953)
1920 Hillhurst Avenue, 406
Los Angeles, CA 90027
Telephone: (323) 968-2632
Facsimile: (415) 395-9940
Email: mb@buttericklaw.com

Bryan L. Clobes (pro hac vice)
Alexander J. Sweatman (pro hac vice)
Mohammed A. Rathur (pro hac vice)
**CAFFERTY CLOBES MERIWETHER
& SPRENGEL LLP**
135 South LaSalle Street, Suite 3210
Chicago, IL 60603
Telephone: (312) 782-4880
Email: bclobes@caffertyclobes.com
asweatman@caffertyclobes.com
mrathur@caffertyclobes.com

*Counsel for Individual and Representative
Plaintiffs and the Proposed Class*

[Additional counsel on signature page]

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

Richard Kadrey, et al.,

Individual and Representative Plaintiffs,

v.

Meta Platforms, Inc.,

Defendant.

Lead Case No. 3:23-cv-03417-VC
Case No. 4:23-cv-06663

**PLAINTIFF JUNOT DIAZ'S
SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSES TO
DEFENDANT META PLATFORMS, INC.'S
SECOND SET OF REQUESTS FOR
ADMISSION**

PROPOUNDING PARTIES: Defendant Meta Platforms, Inc.
RESPONDING PARTIES: Plaintiff Junot Diaz
SET NUMBER: Two (2)

Plaintiff Junot Diaz (“Plaintiff”) hereby amends his responses to Defendant Meta Platforms, Inc.’s (“Defendant” or “Meta”) Second Set of Requests for Admissions (the “Requests” or “RFAs”).

GENERAL OBJECTIONS

1. Plaintiff generally objects to Defendant’s definitions and instructions to the extent they purport to require Plaintiff to respond in any way beyond what is required by the Federal and local rules.

2. Plaintiff objects to the Requests to the extent they seek information or materials that are protected from disclosure by attorney-client privilege, the work product doctrine, expert disclosure rules, or other applicable privileges and protections, including communications with Plaintiff’s attorneys regarding the Action.

Discovery in this matter is ongoing and Plaintiff reserves the right to amend, modify, or supplement these responses with subsequently discovered responsive information and to introduce and rely upon any such subsequently discovered information in this litigation.

SUPPLEMENTAL OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO INDIVIDUAL REQUESTS

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 18:

Admit that, other than YOUR contention that LLM developers such as Meta should have compensated YOU to allegedly use YOUR ASSERTED WORKS to train large language models, YOU are unaware of any specific licensing opportunity that YOU lost due to the infringement alleged in the COMPLAINT.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 18:

Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for discovery that is irrelevant and/or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. Plaintiff will construe the terms “You” and “Your” as referring to Plaintiff Junot Diaz. Plaintiff objects to this Request as

irrelevant to any claim or defense and disproportional to the status and needs of this case. Plaintiff objects to this Request because it is hypothetical and is not tied to the facts of the case. *See, e.g., Buchanan v. Chi. Transit Auth.*, 2016 WL 7116591, at *5 (N.D. Ill. Dec. 7, 2016) (“Since requests to admit ‘must be connected to the facts of the case, courts do not permit “hypothetical” questions within requests for admission.”); *Fulhorst v. Un. Techs. Auto., Inc.*, 1997 WL 873548, at *3 (D. Del. Nov. 17, 1997) (denying request “asking Plaintiff to admit to infringement in the context of the hypothetical use of its device”); Fed. R. Civ. P. 36 advisory committee’s note to 1946 amendment. There is no way for Plaintiff to know what his licensing opportunities would have been but for Meta’s failure to compensate, let alone other LLM developers. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Plaintiff responds that after a reasonable inquiry, the information known or that can be readily obtained by him is insufficient to enable him to admit or deny.

SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 18:

Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for discovery that is irrelevant and/or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. Plaintiff will construe the terms “You” and “Your” as referring to Plaintiff Junot Diaz. Plaintiff objects to this Request as irrelevant to any claim or defense and disproportional to the status and needs of this case. Plaintiff objects to this Request because it is hypothetical and is not tied to the facts of the case. *See, e.g., Buchanan v. Chi. Transit Auth.*, 2016 WL 7116591, at *5 (N.D. Ill. Dec. 7, 2016) (“Since requests to admit ‘must be connected to the facts of the case, courts do not permit “hypothetical” questions within requests for admission.”); *Fulhorst v. Un. Techs. Auto., Inc.*, 1997 WL 873548, at *3 (D. Del. Nov. 17, 1997) (denying request “asking Plaintiff to admit to infringement in the context of the hypothetical use of its device”); Fed. R. Civ. P. 36 advisory committee’s note to 1946 amendment. There is no way for Plaintiff to know what his licensing opportunities would have been but for Meta’s failure to compensate, let alone other LLM developers. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Plaintiff responds, admit.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 19:

Admit that, other than YOUR contention that LLM developers such as Meta should have

1 Dated: September 19, 2024

By: /s/ Bryan L. Clobes
Bryan L. Clobes

2
3 Joseph R. Saveri (State Bar No. 130064)
4 Cadio Zirpoli (State Bar No. 179108)
5 Christopher K.L. Young (State Bar No. 318371)
6 Holden Benon (State Bar No. 325847)
7 Aaron Cera (State Bar No. 351163)
8 Margaux Poueymirou (State Bar No. 356000)
9 **JOSEPH SAVERI LAW FIRM, LLP**
601 California Street, Suite 1505
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 500-6800
Facsimile: (415) 395-9940
Email: jsaveri@saverilawfirm.com
czirpoli@saverilawfirm.com
cyoung@saverilawfirm.com
hbenon@saverilawfirm.com
acera@saverilawfirm.com
mpoueymirou@saverilawfirm.com

11 Matthew Butterick (State Bar No. 250953)
12 1920 Hillhurst Avenue, 406
13 Los Angeles, CA 90027
14 Telephone: (323)968-2632
15 Facsimile: (415) 395-9940
16 Email: mb@buttericklaw.com

17 Bryan L. Clobes (pro hac vice)
18 Alexander J. Sweatman (pro hac vice)
19 Mohammed A. Rathur (pro hac vice)
20 **CAFFERTY CLOBES MERIWETHER**
21 **& SPRENGEL LLP**
135 South LaSalle Street, Suite 3210
Chicago, IL 60603
Telephone: (312) 782-4880
Email: bclobes@caffertyclobes.com
asweatman@caffertyclobes.com
mrathur@caffertyclobes.com

22 Daniel J. Muller (State Bar No. 193396)
23 **VENTURA HERSEY & MULLER, LLP**
1506 Hamilton Avenue
San Jose, California 95125
Telephone: (408) 512-3022
Facsimile: (408) 512-3023
Email: dmuller@venturahersey.com

25 *Counsel for Individual and Representative Plaintiffs*
26 *and the Proposed Class*
27
28

Rachel Geman (*pro hac vice*)
 rgeman@lchb.com
 LIEFF CABRASER HEIMANN & BERNSTEIN, LLP
 250 Hudson Street, 8th Floor
 New York, NY 10013-1413
 Telephone: 212.355.9500
 Facsimile: 212.355.9592
 Email: rgeman@lchb.com

Elizabeth J. Cabraser, Esq.
 Daniel M. Hutchinson, Esq.
 Reilly T. Stoler, Esq.
 LIEFF CABRASER HEIMANN & BERNSTEIN, LLP
 275 Battery Street, 29th Floor
 San Francisco, CA 94111-3339
 Telephone: 415.956.1000
 Email: ecabraser@lchb.com
 dhutchinson@lchb.com
 rstoler@lchb.com

Kenneth S. Byrd. (*pro hac vice* forthcoming)
 Betsy A. Sugar (*pro hac vice* forthcoming)
 LIEFF CABRASER HEIMANN & BERNSTEIN, LLP
 222 2nd Avenue South, Suite 1640
 Nashville, TN 37201-2375
 Telephone: 615.313.9000
 Email: kbyrd@lchb.com
 bsugar@lchb.com

Scott J. Sholder (*pro hac vice*)
 CeCe M. Cole (*pro hac vice*)
 COWAN DEBAETS ABRAHAMS & SHEPPARD LLP
 60 Broad Street, 30th Floor
 New York, New York 10004
 Telephone: 212.974.7474
 Email: ssholder@cdas.com
 ccole@cdas.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff
Christopher Farnsworth and
Representative Plaintiffs and the Proposed Class

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

RICHARD KADREY, *et al.*,

Individual and Representative
 Plaintiffs,

Case No. 3:23-cv-03417-VC

PLAINTIFF CHRISTOPHER
 FARNSWORTH'S RESPONSES TO
 DEFENDANT'S FIRST SET OF REQUESTS
 FOR ADMISSIONS

v.

META PLATFORMS, INC, a Delaware
corporation,

Defendant.

PROPOUNDING PARTY: DEFENDANT META PLATFORMS, INC.

RESPONDING PARTY: PLAINTIFF CHRISTOPHER FARNSWORTH

SET NO.: ONE

INTRODUCTION

Plaintiff Christopher Farnsworth (“Plaintiff”) hereby serves his responses and objections to Defendant Meta Platforms, Inc.’s (“Defendant” or “Meta”) First Set of Requests for Admissions (the “Requests” or “RFAs”).

GENERAL OBJECTIONS

1. Plaintiff generally objects to Defendant’s definitions and instructions to the extent they purport to require Plaintiff to respond in any way beyond what is required by the Federal and local rules.

2. Plaintiff objects to the Requests to the extent they seek information or materials that are protected from disclosure by attorney-client privilege, the work product doctrine, expert disclosure rules, or other applicable privileges and protections, including communications with Plaintiff’s attorneys regarding the Action.

3. Discovery in this matter is ongoing and Plaintiff reserves the right to amend, modify, or supplement these responses with subsequently discovered responsive information and to introduce and rely upon any such subsequently discovered information in this litigation.

sought Plaintiff's permission to use any of Plaintiff's Asserted Works as training data for generative artificial intelligence, and so further responding, Plaintiff admits Request No. 10.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 11:

Admit that YOU are unaware of consent ever having been given (either by YOU or somebody so authorized on YOUR behalf) to use of any of YOUR ASSERTED WORKS as training data for artificial intelligence.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 11:

Plaintiff objects that the term "artificial intelligence" is vague and ambiguous and will construe that term to mean generative artificial intelligence. Plaintiff further objects to this Request to the extent that it is duplicative in whole or in part of Requests for Admissions Nos. 8–10 and 13–14. Plaintiff further objects to this Request as an improper subject of a Request for Admission.

Subject to and without waiving these general and specific objections, Plaintiff admits Request No. 11.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 12:

To the extent YOU denied Request for Admission No. 1 because YOU contend that LLM developers such as Meta should have compensated YOU to allegedly use YOUR ASSERTED WORKS to train large language models, admit that YOU are unaware of any lost sales due to the infringement alleged in the COMPLAINT.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 12:

Plaintiff objects that the term "lost sales" is vague and ambiguous. Plaintiff also objects to this Request to the extent that it is an incomplete hypothetical not tied to the facts of the case. *See, e.g., Buchanan v. Chi. Transit Auth.*, 2016 WL 7116591, at *5 (N.D. Ill. Dec. 7, 2016) ("Since requests to admit 'must be connected to the facts of the case, courts do not permit "hypothetical" questions within requests for admission."); *Fulhorst v. Un. Techs. Auto., Inc.*, 1997 WL 873548, at *3 (D. Del. Nov. 17, 1997) (denying request "asking Plaintiff to admit to infringement in the context of the hypothetical use of its device"); Fed. R. Civ. P. 36 advisory committee's note to 1946 amendment. Plaintiff further objects to this Request as duplicative in whole or in part of

1 Request No. 15. Plaintiffs also objects that Plaintiff's position regarding other Request for
2 Admission responses is not the proper subject of a Request for Admission.

3 Subject to and without waiving these general and specific objections, Plaintiff does not
4 respond to this Request because by its own terms the Request is conditioned upon denying
5 Request No. 1 as described. Plaintiff did not deny Request No. 1 as described and directs
6 Defendant to his response to Request No. 1.

7 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 13:**

8 Admit that YOU have no documentary evidence that any PERSON has offered any
9 consideration to YOU for the use of YOUR ASSERTED WORKS to train large language models.

10 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 13:**

11 Plaintiff objects that the terms "documentary evidence" and "consideration" are vague and
12 ambiguous and to the extent that they call for a legal determination. Plaintiff further objects to
13 this Request as duplicative in whole or in part of Requests for Admissions Nos. 8–11 and 14.

14 Subject to and without waiving these general and specific objections, Plaintiff admits that
15 neither Meta nor any other entity gathering training data for large language models has sought
16 Plaintiff's permission to use any of Plaintiff's Asserted Works as training data for large language
17 models, and so, further responding, Plaintiff admits Request No. 13.

18 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 14:**

19 Admit that YOU have no documentary evidence that any PERSON has actually
20 compensated YOU any consideration for use of YOUR ASSERTED WORKS to train large
21 language models.

22 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 14:**

23 Plaintiff objects that the terms "documentary evidence" and "consideration" are vague and
24 ambiguous and to the extent that they call for a legal determination. Plaintiff objects to the phrase
25 "actually compensated" as vague. Plaintiff further objects to this Request as duplicative in whole
26 or in part of Requests for Admissions Nos. 8–11 and 13.

27 Subject to and without waiving these general and specific objections, Plaintiff admits that
28 neither Meta nor any other entity gathering training data for large language models has sought

Plaintiff's permission to use any of Plaintiff's Asserted Works as training data for large language models, and so, further responding, Plaintiff admits Request for Admission No. 14.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 15:

To the extent YOU denied Request for Admission No. 2 because YOU contend that LLM developers such as Meta should have compensated YOU to allegedly use YOUR ASSERTED WORKS to train large language models, admit that YOU are unaware of any documentary evidence that YOU have lost sales of any ASSERTED WORKS due to the infringement alleged in the COMPLAINT.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 15:

Plaintiff objects that the terms "documentary evidence" and "lost sales" are vague and ambiguous. Plaintiff objects to this Request to the extent that it is an incomplete hypothetical and not tied to the facts of the case. *See, e.g., Buchanan v. Chi. Transit Auth.*, 2016 WL 7116591, at *5 (N.D. Ill. Dec. 7, 2016) ("Since requests to admit 'must be connected to the facts of the case, courts do not permit "hypothetical" questions within requests for admission.'"); *Fulhorst v. Un. Techs. Auto., Inc.*, 1997 WL 873548, at *3 (D. Del. Nov. 17, 1997) (denying request "asking Plaintiff to admit to infringement in the context of the hypothetical use of its device"); Fed. R. Civ. P. 36 advisory committee's note to 1946 amendment. Plaintiff further objects to this Request as duplicative in whole or in part of Request No. 12. Plaintiff also objects that Plaintiff's position regarding other Request for Admission responses is not the proper subject of a Request for Admission.

Subject to and without waiving these general and specific objections, Plaintiff does not respond to this Request because by its own terms the Request is conditioned upon denying Request No. 2 as described. Plaintiff did not deny Request No. 2 as described and directs Defendant to his response to Request No. 2.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 16:

Admit that book sales for YOUR ASSERTED WORKS (including through any physical bookstore, on-line bookseller, or any other type of book wholesaler or retailer) have not decreased due to the alleged use of YOUR ASSERTED WORKS to train large language models.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 81:

Admit that you are not aware of any agreements to assign rights in or to YOUR ASSERTED WORK(S) that have not already been produced in this ACTION.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 80:

Plaintiff objects that the terms “any agreements” and “assign rights in or to” are vague and ambiguous. Plaintiff further objects to this Request as compound and ambiguous, because it includes the disjunctive phrase, “in or to.” “[R]equests for admissions should not contain ‘compound, conjunctive, or disjunctive ... statements.’” *James v. Maguire Corr. Facility*, No. C 10-1795 SI PR, 2012 WL 3939343, at *4 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 10, 2012) (*quoting U.S. ex rel. England v. Los Angeles County*, 235 F.R.D. 675, 684 (E.D. Cal. 2006)); *see also King v. Biter*, No. 115CV00414LJOSABPC, 2018 WL 339052, at *6 (E.D. Cal. Jan. 9, 2018).

Subject to and without waiving these general and specific objections, Plaintiff admits discovery is ongoing. Plaintiff further admits that Plaintiff has produced non-privileged documents in Plaintiff’s possession, custody, or control, responsive to Meta’s requests for production regarding licensing agreements for Plaintiff’s Asserted Works. Plaintiff otherwise denies this Request.

Dated: November 18, 2024 Respectfully submitted,

LIEFF CABRASER HEIMANN & BERNSTEIN, LLP

By: /s/ Rachel Geman

Rachel Geman

LIEFF CABRASER HEIMANN & BERNSTEIN, LLP
250 Hudson Street, 8th Floor
New York, NY 10013-1413
Telephone: 212.355.9500
Facsimile: 212.355.959
Email: rgeman@lchb.com

Rachel Geman (*pro hac vice*)
 rgeman@lchb.com
 LIEFF CABRASER HEIMANN & BERNSTEIN, LLP
 250 Hudson Street, 8th Floor
 New York, NY 10013-1413
 Telephone: 212.355.9500
 Facsimile: 212.355.9592
 Email: rgeman@lchb.com

Elizabeth J. Cabraser, Esq.
 Daniel M. Hutchinson, Esq.
 Reilly T. Stoler, Esq.
 LIEFF CABRASER HEIMANN & BERNSTEIN, LLP
 275 Battery Street, 29th Floor
 San Francisco, CA 94111-3339
 Telephone: 415.956.1000
 Email: ecabraser@lchb.com
 dhutchinson@lchb.com
 rstoler@lchb.com

Kenneth S. Byrd. (*pro hac vice* forthcoming)
 Betsy A. Sugar (*pro hac vice* forthcoming)
 LIEFF CABRASER HEIMANN & BERNSTEIN, LLP
 222 2nd Avenue South, Suite 1640
 Nashville, TN 37201-2375
 Telephone: 615.313.9000
 Email: kbyrd@lchb.com
 bsugar@lchb.com

Scott J. Sholder (*pro hac vice*)
 CeCe M. Cole (*pro hac vice*)
 COWAN DEBAETS ABRAHAMS & SHEPPARD LLP
 60 Broad Street, 30th Floor
 New York, New York 10004
 Telephone: 212.974.7474
 Email: ssholder@cdas.com
 ccole@cdas.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff
Christopher Farnsworth and
Representative Plaintiffs and the Proposed Class

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

RICHARD KADREY, *et al.*,

Individual and Representative
 Plaintiffs,

Case No. 3:23-cv-03417-VC

PLAINTIFF CHRISTOPHER
 FARNSWORTH'S RESPONSES TO
 DEFENDANT'S FIRST SET OF REQUESTS
 FOR ADMISSIONS

v.

META PLATFORMS, INC, a Delaware
corporation,

Defendant.

PROPOUNDING PARTY: DEFENDANT META PLATFORMS, INC.

RESPONDING PARTY: PLAINTIFF CHRISTOPHER FARNSWORTH

SET NO.: ONE

INTRODUCTION

Plaintiff Christopher Farnsworth (“Plaintiff”) hereby serves his responses and objections to Defendant Meta Platforms, Inc.’s (“Defendant” or “Meta”) First Set of Requests for Admissions (the “Requests” or “RFAs”).

GENERAL OBJECTIONS

1. Plaintiff generally objects to Defendant’s definitions and instructions to the extent they purport to require Plaintiff to respond in any way beyond what is required by the Federal and local rules.

2. Plaintiff objects to the Requests to the extent they seek information or materials that are protected from disclosure by attorney-client privilege, the work product doctrine, expert disclosure rules, or other applicable privileges and protections, including communications with Plaintiff’s attorneys regarding the Action.

3. Discovery in this matter is ongoing and Plaintiff reserves the right to amend, modify, or supplement these responses with subsequently discovered responsive information and to introduce and rely upon any such subsequently discovered information in this litigation.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 16:

Plaintiff objects that the term “book sales” is vague and ambiguous. Plaintiff objects that the Request is not limited in time and is therefore overbroad and vague as to “decline.” Plaintiff objects to this Request to the extent that it is an incomplete hypothetical and not tied to the facts of the case. *See, e.g., Buchanan v. Chi. Transit Auth.*, 2016 WL 7116591, at *5 (N.D. Ill. Dec. 7, 2016) (“Since requests to admit ‘must be connected to the facts of the case, courts do not permit “hypothetical” questions within requests for admission.”); *Fulhorst v. Un. Techs. Auto., Inc.*, 1997 WL 873548, at *3 (D. Del. Nov. 17, 1997) (denying request “asking Plaintiff to admit to infringement in the context of the hypothetical use of its device”); Fed. R. Civ. P. 36 advisory committee’s note to 1946 amendment. Plaintiff objects to this Request to the extent that it seeks information that is properly the subject of expert testimony. Plaintiff further objects to this Request as an improper subject of a Request for Admission.

Subject to and without waiving these general and specific objections, Plaintiff responds that he will not admit or deny this Request, on the grounds that the information requested is not a proper subject of a Request for Admission. If a response is deemed required, Plaintiff denies the Request on this same basis. Plaintiff agrees to meet and confer on the appropriate vehicle for discovering Plaintiffs’ current knowledge or awareness.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 17:

Admit that YOU are aware that YOUR ASSERTED WORKS have been a part of a dataset that has been used to train large language models beyond those large language models by Meta.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 17:

Plaintiff objects to the term “book sales” is vague and ambiguous. Plaintiff further objects to this Request as an improper subject of a Request for Admission.

Subject to and without waiving these general and specific objections, Plaintiff admits Request No. 17.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 18:

To the extent YOU denied Request for Admission No. 3 because YOU contend that LLM

1 developers such as Meta should have compensated YOU to allegedly use YOUR ASSERTED
 2 WORKS to train large language models, admit that YOU are unaware of any specific licensing
 3 opportunity that YOU lost due to the infringement alleged in the COMPLAINT.

4 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 18:**

5 Plaintiff objects that the terms “opportunity” and “lost” are vague and ambiguous.
 6 Plaintiff objects to this Request to the extent that it is an incomplete hypothetical and not tied to
 7 the facts of the case. *See, e.g., Buchanan v. Chi. Transit Auth.*, 2016 WL 7116591, at *5 (N.D. Ill.
 8 Dec. 7, 2016) (“Since requests to admit ‘must be connected to the facts of the case, courts do not
 9 permit “hypothetical” questions within requests for admission.”); *Fulhorst v. Un. Techs. Auto.,*
 10 *Inc.*, 1997 WL 873548, at *3 (D. Del. Nov. 17, 1997) (denying request “asking Plaintiff to admit
 11 to infringement in the context of the hypothetical use of its device”); Fed. R. Civ. P. 36 advisory
 12 committee’s note to 1946 amendment. There is no way for Plaintiff to know what his licensing
 13 opportunities would have been but for Meta’s failure to compensate Plaintiff, let alone other LLM
 14 developers. Plaintiff also objects that Plaintiff’s position regarding other Request for Admission
 15 responses is not the proper subject of a Request for Admission.

16 Subject to and without waiving these general and specific objections, Plaintiff does not
 17 respond to this Request because by its own terms the Request is conditioned upon denying
 18 Request No. 3 as described. Plaintiff did not deny Request No. 3 as described and directs
 19 Defendant to his response to Request No. 3.

20 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 19:**

21 To the extent YOU denied Request for Admission No. 4 because YOU contend that LLM
 22 developers such as Meta should have compensated YOU to allegedly use YOUR ASSERTED
 23 WORKS to train large language models, admit that YOU are unaware of any documentary
 24 evidence that YOU lost a specific licensing opportunity due to the infringement alleged in the
 25 COMPLAINT.

26 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 19:**

27 Plaintiff objects that the terms “opportunity” and “documentary evidence” are vague and
 28 ambiguous. Plaintiff further objects to this Request to the extent that it is an incomplete

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 81:

Admit that you are not aware of any agreements to assign rights in or to YOUR ASSERTED WORK(S) that have not already been produced in this ACTION.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 80:

Plaintiff objects that the terms “any agreements” and “assign rights in or to” are vague and ambiguous. Plaintiff further objects to this Request as compound and ambiguous, because it includes the disjunctive phrase, “in or to.” “[R]equests for admissions should not contain ‘compound, conjunctive, or disjunctive ... statements.’” *James v. Maguire Corr. Facility*, No. C 10-1795 SI PR, 2012 WL 3939343, at *4 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 10, 2012) (*quoting U.S. ex rel. England v. Los Angeles County*, 235 F.R.D. 675, 684 (E.D. Cal. 2006)); *see also King v. Biter*, No. 115CV00414LJOSABPC, 2018 WL 339052, at *6 (E.D. Cal. Jan. 9, 2018).

Subject to and without waiving these general and specific objections, Plaintiff admits discovery is ongoing. Plaintiff further admits that Plaintiff has produced non-privileged documents in Plaintiff’s possession, custody, or control, responsive to Meta’s requests for production regarding licensing agreements for Plaintiff’s Asserted Works. Plaintiff otherwise denies this Request.

Dated: November 18, 2024 Respectfully submitted,

LIEFF CABRASER HEIMANN & BERNSTEIN, LLP

By: /s/ Rachel Geman

Rachel Geman

LIEFF CABRASER HEIMANN & BERNSTEIN, LLP
250 Hudson Street, 8th Floor
New York, NY 10013-1413
Telephone: 212.355.9500
Facsimile: 212.355.959
Email: rgeman@lchb.com

Joseph R. Saveri (State Bar No. 130064)
Cadio Zirpoli (State Bar No. 179108)
Christopher K.L. Young (State Bar No. 318371)
Holden Benon (State Bar No. 325847)
Aaron Cera (State Bar No. 351163)
Margaux Poueymirou (State Bar No. 356000)

JOSEPH SAVERI LAW FIRM, LLP

601 California Street, Suite 1505

San Francisco, California 94108

Telephone: (415) 500-6800

Facsimile: (415) 395-9940

Email: jsaveri@saverilawfirm.com

czirpoli@saverilawfirm.com

cyoung@saverilawfirm.com

hbenon@saverilawfirm.com

acera@saverilawfirm.com

mpoueymirou@saverilawfirm.com

Matthew Butterick (State Bar No. 250953)

1920 Hillhurst Avenue, 406

Los Angeles, CA 90027

Telephone: (323) 968-2632

Facsimile: (415) 395-9940

Email: mb@buttericklaw.com

Bryan L. Clobes (pro hac vice)

Alexander J. Sweatman (pro hac vice anticipated)

**CAFFERTY CLOBES MERIWETHER
& SPRENGEL LLP**

135 South LaSalle Street, Suite 3210

Chicago, IL 60603

Telephone: (312) 782-4880

Email: bclobes@caffertyclobes.com

asweatman@caffertyclobes.com

*Counsel for Individual and Representative
Plaintiffs and the Proposed Class*

[Additional counsel on signature page]

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

Richard Kadrey, et al.,

Individual and Representative Plaintiffs,

v.

Meta Platforms, Inc.,

Defendant.

Lead Case No. 3:23-cv-03417-VC

Case No. 4:23-cv-06663

**PLAINTIFF CHRISTOPHER GOLDEN'S
AMENDED RESPONSES TO
DEFENDANT META PLATFORMS,
INC.'S SECOND SET OF REQUESTS FOR
ADMISSION**

1 duplicative in whole or in part of RFAs 8-9, 11, and 13-14. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing
2 objections, Plaintiff responds, admit.

3 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 11:**

4 Admit that YOU are unaware of consent ever having been given (either by YOU or somebody so
5 authorized on YOUR behalf) to use of any of YOUR ASSERTED WORKS as training data for artificial
6 intelligence.

7 **AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 11:**

8 Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for
9 discovery that is irrelevant and /or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it
10 includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. As narrowed by the parties,
11 Plaintiff will construe “You” and “Your” to include Plaintiff individually, and his agents. Plaintiff
12 objects to this Request as unintelligible and vague as to the term “artificial intelligence” and will
13 construe that term to mean generative artificial intelligence. Plaintiff further objects to this Request as
14 duplicative in whole or in part of RFAs 8-10 and 13-14. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing
15 objections, Plaintiff responds, admit.

16 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 12:**

17 Admit that, other than YOUR contention that LLM developers such as Meta should have
18 compensated YOU to allegedly use YOUR ASSERTED WORKS to train large language models (see,
19 e.g., [March 7, 2024 denial of RFA No. 1), YOU are unaware of any lost sales due to the infringement
20 alleged in the COMPLAINT.

21 **AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 12:**

22 Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for
23 discovery that is irrelevant and /or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it
24 includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. As narrowed by the parties,
25 Plaintiff will construe “You” and “Your” to include Plaintiff individually, and his agents. Plaintiff
26 objects to the term “lost sales” as rendering this Request vague and ambiguous. Plaintiff further objects
27 to this Request because it is hypothetical and not tied to the facts of the case. See, e.g., *Buchanan v. Chi.*

1 *Transit Auth.*, 2016 WL 7116591, at *5 (N.D. Ill. Dec. 7, 2016) (“Since requests to admit ‘must be
 2 connected to the facts of the case, courts do not permit “hypothetical” questions within requests for
 3 admission.’”); *Fulhorst v. Un. Techs. Auto., Inc.*, 1997 WL 873548, at *3 (D. Del. Nov. 17, 1997)
 4 (denying request “asking Plaintiff to admit to infringement in the context of the hypothetical use of its
 5 device”); Fed. R. Civ. P. 36 advisory committee’s note to 1946 amendment. Plaintiff further objects to
 6 this Request as duplicative in whole or in part of RFA 15. Further, this Request seeks premature expert
 7 opinion. Plaintiffs are still investigating their damages theory. Subject to and without waiving the
 8 foregoing objections, Plaintiff responds, as of today, admit.

9 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 13:**

10 Admit that YOU have no documentary evidence that any PERSON has offered any
 11 consideration to YOU for the use of YOUR ASSERTED WORKS to train large language models.

12 **AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 13:**

13 Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for
 14 discovery that is irrelevant and/or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it
 15 includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. As narrowed by the parties,
 16 Plaintiff will construe “You” and “Your” to include Plaintiff individually, and his agents. Plaintiff also
 17 objects to the term “documentary evidence” as being vague and overbroad because it is not limited to
 18 the specific claims and defenses raised in this dispute. Plaintiff further objects to this Request as
 19 duplicative in whole or in part of RFAs 8-11, and 14. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing
 20 objections, Plaintiff responds, admit.

21 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 14:**

22 Admit that YOU have no documentary evidence that any PERSON has actually compensated
 23 YOU any consideration for use of YOUR ASSERTED WORKS to train large language models.

24 **AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 14:**

25 Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for
 26 discovery that is irrelevant and/or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it
 27 includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. As narrowed by the parties,

Plaintiff will construe “You” and “Your” to include Plaintiff individually, and his agents. Plaintiff also objects to the term “documentary evidence” as being vague and overbroad because it is not limited to the specific claims and defenses raised in this dispute. Plaintiff further objects to this Request as duplicative in whole or in part of RFAs 8-11, and 13. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Plaintiff responds, admit.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 15:

Admit that, other than YOUR contention that LLM developers such as Meta should have compensated YOU to allegedly use YOUR ASSERTED WORKS to train large language models, YOU are unaware of any documentary evidence that YOU have lost sales of any ASSERTED WORKS due to the infringement alleged in the COMPLAINT.

AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 15:

Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for discovery that is irrelevant and/or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. As narrowed by the parties, Plaintiff will construe “You” and “Your” to include Plaintiff individually, and his agents. Plaintiff also objects to the term “documentary evidence” as being vague and overbroad because it is not limited to the specific claims and defenses raised in this dispute. Plaintiff further objects to the term “lost sales” as rendering this Request vague and ambiguous. Plaintiff also objects to this Request because it is hypothetical and is not tied to the facts of the case. See, e.g., *Buchanan v. Chi. Transit Auth.*, 2016 WL 7116591, at *5 (N.D. Ill. Dec. 7, 2016) (“Since requests to admit ‘must be connected to the facts of the case, courts do not permit “hypothetical” questions within requests for admission.’”); *Fulhorst v. Un. Techs. Auto., Inc.*, 1997 WL 873548, at *3 (D. Del. Nov. 17, 1997) (denying request “asking Plaintiff to admit to infringement in the context of the hypothetical use of its device”); Fed. R. Civ. P. 36 advisory committee’s note to 1946 amendment. Plaintiff further objects to this Request as duplicative in whole or in part of RFA 12. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Plaintiff responds, admit.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 16:

Admit that book sales for YOUR ASSERTED WORKS (including through any physical

1 Dated: August 28, 2024

By: /s/ Joseph R. Saveri
Joseph R. Saveri

2
3 Joseph R. Saveri (State Bar No. 130064)
4 Cadio Zirpoli (State Bar No. 179108)
5 Christopher K.L. Young (State Bar No. 318371)
6 Holden Benon (State Bar No. 325847)
7 Aaron Cera (State Bar No. 351163)
8 Margaux Poueymirou (State Bar No. 356000)
9 **JOSEPH SAVERI LAW FIRM, LLP**
10 601 California Street, Suite 1505
11 San Francisco, California 94108
12 Telephone: (415) 500-6800
13 Facsimile: (415) 395-9940
14 Email: jsaveri@saverilawfirm.com
15 czirpoli@saverilawfirm.com
16 cyoung@saverilawfirm.com
17 hbenon@saverilawfirm.com
18 acera@saverilawfirm.com
19 mpoueymirou@saverilawfirm.com

20
21 Matthew Butterick (State Bar No. 250953)
22 1920 Hillhurst Avenue, 406
23 Los Angeles, CA 90027
24 Telephone: (323)968-2632
25 Facsimile: (415) 395-9940
26 Email: mb@buttericklaw.com

27
Bryan L. Clobes (pro hac vice)
Alexander J. Sweatman (*pro hac vice anticipated*)
**CAFFERTY CLOBES MERIWETHER
& SPRENGEL LLP**
135 South LaSalle Street, Suite 3210
Chicago, IL 60603
Telephone: (312) 782-4880
Email: bclobes@caffertyclobes.com
asweatman@caffertyclobes.com

Daniel J. Muller (State Bar No. 193396)
VENTURA HERSEY & MULLER, LLP
1506 Hamilton Avenue
San Jose, California 95125
Telephone: (408) 512-3022
Facsimile: (408) 512-3023
Email: dmuller@venturahersey.com

*Counsel for Individual and Representative Plaintiffs
and the Proposed Class*

Joseph R. Saveri (State Bar No. 130064)
 Cadio Zirpoli (State Bar No. 179108)
 Christopher K.L. Young (State Bar No. 318371)
 Holden Benon (State Bar No. 325847)
 Aaron Cera (State Bar No. 351163)
 Margaux Poueymirou (State Bar No. 356000)
JOSEPH SAVERI LAW FIRM, LLP
 601 California Street, Suite 1505
 San Francisco, California 94108
 Telephone: (415) 500-6800
 Facsimile: (415) 395-9940
 Email: jsaveri@saverilawfirm.com
 czirpoli@saverilawfirm.com
 cyoung@saverilawfirm.com
 hbenon@saverilawfirm.com
 acera@saverilawfirm.com
 mpoueymirou@saverilawfirm.com

Matthew Butterick (State Bar No. 250953)
 1920 Hillhurst Avenue, 406
 Los Angeles, CA 90027
 Telephone: (323) 968-2632
 Facsimile: (415) 395-9940
 Email: mb@buttericklaw.com

*Counsel for Individual and Representative
 Plaintiffs and the Proposed Class*

[Additional counsel on signature page]

Bryan L. Clobes (*pro hac vice*)
 Alexander J. Sweatman (*pro hac vice*)
**CAFFERTY CLOBES MERIWETHER
 & SPRENGEL LLP**
 135 South LaSalle Street, Suite 3210
 Chicago, IL 60603
 Telephone: (312) 782-4880
 Email: bclobes@caffertyclobes.com
 asweatman@caffertyclobes.com

David A. Straite (*pro hac vice*)
DICELLO LEVITT LLP
 4747 Executive Drive, 2nd Floor
 San Diego, California 92121
 Telephone: (619) 923-3939
 Email: dstraite@dicellolevitt.com

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

Richard Kadrey, et al.,
Individual and Representative Plaintiffs,
 v.
 Meta Platforms, Inc.,
Defendant.

Lead Case No. 3:23-cv-03417-VC
 Case No. 4:23-cv-06663

**PLAINTIFF CHRISTOPHER GOLDEN'S
 AMENDED RESPONSES TO
 DEFENDANT META PLATFORMS,
 INC.'S SECOND SET OF REQUESTS FOR
 ADMISSION**

1 **PROPOUNDING PARTIES:** **Defendant Meta Platforms, Inc.**
2 **RESPONDING PARTIES:** **Plaintiff Christopher Golden**
3 **SET NUMBER:** **Two (2)**

4
5 Plaintiff Christopher Golden (“Plaintiff”) hereby amends his responses to Defendant Meta
6 Platforms, Inc.’s (“Defendant” or “Meta”) Second Set of Requests for Admissions (the “Requests”
7 or “RFAs”).

8 **GENERAL OBJECTIONS**

9 1. Plaintiff generally objects to Defendant’s definitions and instructions to the extent they
10 purport to require Plaintiff to respond in any way beyond what is required by the Federal and local rules.

11 2. Plaintiff objects to the Requests to the extent they seek information or materials that are
12 protected from disclosure by attorney-client privilege, the work product doctrine, expert disclosure
13 rules, or other applicable privileges and protections, including communications with Plaintiff’s
14 attorneys regarding the Action.

15 Discovery in this matter is ongoing and Plaintiff reserves the right to amend, modify, or
16 supplement these responses with subsequently discovered responsive information and to introduce and
17 rely upon any such subsequently discovered information in this litigation.

18 **AMENDED OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO INDIVIDUAL REQUESTS**

19 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 18:**

20 Admit that, other than YOUR contention that LLM developers such as Meta should have
21 compensated YOU to allegedly use YOUR ASSERTED WORKS to train large language models, YOU
22 are unaware of any specific licensing opportunity that YOU lost due to the infringement alleged in the
23 COMPLAINT.

24 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 18:**

25 Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for
26 discovery that is irrelevant and/or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it
27 includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. Plaintiff will construe the
28 terms “You” and “Your” as referring to Plaintiff Christopher Golden. Plaintiff objects to this Request

as irrelevant to any claim or defense and disproportional to the status and needs of this case. Plaintiff objects to this Request because it is hypothetical and is not tied to the facts of the case. *See, e.g., Buchanan v. Chi. Transit Auth.*, 2016 WL 7116591, at *5 (N.D. Ill. Dec. 7, 2016) (“Since requests to admit ‘must be connected to the facts of the case, courts do not permit “hypothetical” questions within requests for admission.’”); *Fulhorst v. Un. Techs. Auto., Inc.*, 1997 WL 873548, at *3 (D. Del. Nov. 17, 1997) (denying request “asking Plaintiff to admit to infringement in the context of the hypothetical use of its device”); Fed. R. Civ. P. 36 advisory committee’s note to 1946 amendment. There is no way for Plaintiff to know what his licensing opportunities would have been but for Meta’s failure to compensate, let alone other LLM developers. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Plaintiff responds that after a reasonable inquiry, the information known or that can be readily obtained by him is insufficient to enable him to admit or deny.

AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 18:

Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for discovery that is irrelevant and/or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. Plaintiff will construe the terms “You” and “Your” as referring to Plaintiff Christopher Golden. Plaintiff objects to this Request as irrelevant to any claim or defense and disproportional to the status and needs of this case. Plaintiff objects to this Request because it is hypothetical and is not tied to the facts of the case. *See, e.g., Buchanan v. Chi. Transit Auth.*, 2016 WL 7116591, at *5 (N.D. Ill. Dec. 7, 2016) (“Since requests to admit ‘must be connected to the facts of the case, courts do not permit “hypothetical” questions within requests for admission.’”); *Fulhorst v. Un. Techs. Auto., Inc.*, 1997 WL 873548, at *3 (D. Del. Nov. 17, 1997) (denying request “asking Plaintiff to admit to infringement in the context of the hypothetical use of its device”); Fed. R. Civ. P. 36 advisory committee’s note to 1946 amendment. There is no way for Plaintiff to know what his licensing opportunities would have been but for Meta’s failure to compensate, let alone other LLM developers. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Plaintiff responds, admit.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 19:

Admit that, other than YOUR contention that LLM developers such as Meta should have

1 Dated: September 19, 2024

By: /s/ Joseph R. Saveri
Joseph R. Saveri

2
3 Joseph R. Saveri (State Bar No. 130064)
4 Cadio Zirpoli (State Bar No. 179108)
5 Christopher K.L. Young (State Bar No. 318371)
6 Holden Benon (State Bar No. 325847)
7 Aaron Cera (State Bar No. 351163)
8 Margaux Poueymirou (State Bar No. 356000)
9 **JOSEPH SAVERI LAW FIRM, LLP**
10 601 California Street, Suite 1505
11 San Francisco, California 94108
12 Telephone: (415) 500-6800
13 Facsimile: (415) 395-9940
14 Email: jsaveri@saverilawfirm.com
15 czirpoli@saverilawfirm.com
16 cyoung@saverilawfirm.com
17 hbenon@saverilawfirm.com
18 acera@saverilawfirm.com
19 mpoueymirou@saverilawfirm.com

20
21 Matthew Butterick (State Bar No. 250953)
22 1920 Hillhurst Avenue, 406
23 Los Angeles, CA 90027
24 Telephone: (323)968-2632
25 Facsimile: (415) 395-9940
26 Email: mb@buttericklaw.com

27
28 Bryan L. Clobes (pro hac vice)
Alexander J. Sweatman (*pro hac vice anticipated*)
**CAFFERTY CLOBES MERIWETHER
& SPRENGEL LLP**
135 South LaSalle Street, Suite 3210
Chicago, IL 60603
Telephone: (312) 782-4880
Email: bclobes@caffertyclobes.com
asweatman@caffertyclobes.com

Daniel J. Muller (State Bar No. 193396)
VENTURA HERSEY & MULLER, LLP
1506 Hamilton Avenue
San Jose, California 95125
Telephone: (408) 512-3022
Facsimile: (408) 512-3023
Email: dmuller@venturahersey.com

Joseph R. Saveri (State Bar No. 130064)
Cadio Zirpoli (State Bar No. 179108)
Christopher K.L. Young (State Bar No. 318371)
Holden Benon (State Bar No. 325847)
Aaron Cera (State Bar No. 351163)
Margaux Poueymirou (State Bar No. 356000)
JOSEPH SAVERI LAW FIRM, LLP
601 California Street, Suite 1505
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 500-6800
Facsimile: (415) 395-9940
Email: jsaveri@saverilawfirm.com
czirpoli@saverilawfirm.com
cyoung@saverilawfirm.com
hbenon@saverilawfirm.com
acera@saverilawfirm.com
mpoueymirou@saverilawfirm.com

Matthew Butterick (State Bar No. 250953)
1920 Hillhurst Avenue, 406
Los Angeles, CA 90027
Telephone: (323) 968-2632
Facsimile: (415) 395-9940
Email: mb@buttericklaw.com

Bryan L. Clobes (pro hac vice)
Alexander J. Sweatman (pro hac vice)
Mohammed A. Rathur (pro hac vice anticipated)
**CAFFERTY CLOBES MERIWETHER
& SPRENGEL LLP**
135 South LaSalle Street, Suite 3210
Chicago, IL 60603
Telephone: (312) 782-4880
Email: bclobes@caffertyclobes.com
asweatman@caffertyclobes.com
mrathur@caffertyclobes.com

*Counsel for Individual and Representative
Plaintiffs and the Proposed Class*

[Additional counsel on signature page]

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

Richard Kadrey, et al.,

Individual and Representative Plaintiffs,

v.

Meta Platforms, Inc.,

Defendant.

Lead Case No. 3:23-cv-03417-VC
Case No. 4:23-cv-06663

**PLAINTIFF ANDREW SEAN GREER'S
AMENDED RESPONSES TO DEFENDANT
META PLATFORMS, INC.'S SECOND SET
OF REQUESTS FOR ADMISSION**

1 duplicative in whole or in part of RFAs 8-9, 11, and 13-14. Subject to and without waiving the
2 foregoing objections, Plaintiff responds as follows: admit.

3 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 11:**

4 Admit that YOU are unaware of consent ever having been given (either by YOU or somebody
5 so authorized on YOUR behalf) to use of any of YOUR ASSERTED WORKS as training data for
6 artificial intelligence.

7 **AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 11:**

8 Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for
9 discovery that is irrelevant and /or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it
10 includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. As narrowed by the parties,
11 Plaintiff will construe “You” and “Your” to include Plaintiff individually, and his agents. Plaintiff
12 objects to this Request as unintelligible and vague as to the term “artificial intelligence” and will
13 construe that term to mean generative artificial intelligence. Plaintiff further objects to this Request as
14 duplicative in whole or in part of RFAs 8-10 and 13-14. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing
15 objections, Plaintiff responds as follows: admit.

16 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 12:**

17 Admit that, other than YOUR contention that LLM developers such as Meta should have
18 compensated YOU to allegedly use YOUR ASSERTED WORKS to train large language models (see,
19 e.g., [March 7, 2024 denial of RFA No. 1], YOU are unaware of any lost sales due to the infringement
20 alleged in the COMPLAINT.

21 **AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 12:**

22 Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for
23 discovery that is irrelevant and /or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it
24 includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. As narrowed by the parties,
25 Plaintiff will construe “You” and “Your” to include Plaintiff individually, and his agents. Plaintiff
26 objects to the term “lost sales” as vague and ambiguous. Plaintiff further objects to this Request
27 because it is hypothetical and not tied to the facts of the case. See, e.g., *Buchanan v. Chi. Transit Auth.*,
2016 WL 7116591, at *5 (N.D. Ill. Dec. 7, 2016) (“Since requests to admit ‘must be connected to the

1 facts of the case, courts do not permit “hypothetical” questions within requests for admission.”);
2 *Fulhorst v. Un. Techs. Auto., Inc.*, 1997 WL 873548, at *3 (D. Del. Nov. 17, 1997) (denying request
3 “asking Plaintiff to admit to infringement in the context of the hypothetical use of its device”); Fed. R.
4 Civ. P. 36 advisory committee’s note to 1946 amendment. Plaintiff further objects to this Request as
5 duplicative in whole or in part of RFA 15. Further, this Request seeks premature expert opinion.
6 Plaintiffs are still investigating their damages theory. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing
7 objections, Plaintiff responds as follows: admit.

8 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 13:**

9 Admit that YOU have no documentary evidence that any PERSON has offered any
10 consideration to YOU for the use of YOUR ASSERTED WORKS to train large language models.

11 **AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 13:**

12 Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for
13 discovery that is irrelevant and/or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it
14 includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. As narrowed by the parties,
15 Plaintiff will construe “You” and “Your” to include Plaintiff individually, and his agents. Plaintiff also
16 objects to the term “documentary evidence” as vague and overbroad because it is not limited to the
17 specific claims and defenses raised in this dispute. Plaintiff further objects to this Request as
18 duplicative in whole or in part of RFAs 8-11, and 14. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing
19 objections, Plaintiff responds as follows: admit.

20 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 14:**

21 Admit that YOU have no documentary evidence that any PERSON has actually compensated
22 YOU any consideration for use of YOUR ASSERTED WORKS to train large language models.

23 **AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 14:**

24 Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for
25 discovery that is irrelevant and/or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it
26 includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. As narrowed by the parties,
27 Plaintiff will construe “You” and “Your” to include Plaintiff individually, and his agents. Plaintiff also
objects to the term “documentary evidence” as vague and overbroad because it is not limited to the

specific claims and defenses raised in this dispute. Plaintiff further objects to this Request as duplicative in whole or in part of RFAs 8-11, and 13. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Plaintiff responds as follows: admit.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 15:

Admit that, other than YOUR contention that LLM developers such as Meta should have compensated YOU to allegedly use YOUR ASSERTED WORKS to train large language models, YOU are unaware of any documentary evidence that YOU have lost sales of any ASSERTED WORKS due to the infringement alleged in the COMPLAINT.

AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 15:

Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for discovery that is irrelevant and/or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. As narrowed by the parties, Plaintiff will construe “You” and “Your” to include Plaintiff individually, and his agents. Plaintiff also objects to the term “documentary evidence” as being vague and overbroad because it is not limited to the specific claims and defenses raised in this case. Plaintiff further objects to the term “lost sales” as vague and ambiguous. Plaintiff also objects to this Request because it is hypothetical and not tied to the facts of the case. See, e.g., *Buchanan v. Chi. Transit Auth.*, 2016 WL 7116591, at *5 (N.D. Ill. Dec. 7, 2016) (“Since requests to admit ‘must be connected to the facts of the case, courts do not permit “hypothetical” questions within requests for admission.”); *Fulhorst v. Un. Techs. Auto., Inc.*, 1997 WL 873548, at *3 (D. Del. Nov. 17, 1997) (denying request “asking Plaintiff to admit to infringement in the context of the hypothetical use of its device”); Fed. R. Civ. P. 36 advisory committee’s note to 1946 amendment. Plaintiff further objects to this Request as duplicative in whole or in part of RFA 12. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Plaintiff responds as follows: admit.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 16:

Admit that book sales for YOUR ASSERTED WORKS (including through any physical bookstore, on-line bookseller, or any other type of book wholesaler or retailer) have not decreased due to the alleged use of YOUR ASSERTED WORKS to train large language models.

1 Dated: September 6, 2024

By: /s/ Bryan L. Clobes
Bryan L. Clobes

2
3 Joseph R. Saveri (State Bar No. 130064)
Cadio Zirpoli (State Bar No. 179108)
4 Christopher K.L. Young (State Bar No. 318371)
Holden Benon (State Bar No. 325847)
5 Aaron Cera (State Bar No. 351163)
Margaux Poueymirou (State Bar No. 356000)
6 **JOSEPH SAVERI LAW FIRM, LLP**
601 California Street, Suite 1505
7 San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 500-6800
8 Facsimile: (415) 395-9940
Email: jsaveri@saverilawfirm.com
9 czirpoli@saverilawfirm.com
cyoung@saverilawfirm.com
10 hbenon@saverilawfirm.com
acera@saverilawfirm.com
mpoueymirou@saverilawfirm.com

11 Matthew Butterick (State Bar No. 250953)
12 1920 Hillhurst Avenue, 406
Los Angeles, CA 90027
13 Telephone: (323)968-2632
14 Facsimile: (415) 395-9940
Email: mb@buttericklaw.com

15 Bryan L. Clobes (pro hac vice)
16 Alexander J. Sweatman (pro hac vice)
Mohammed A. Rathur (pro hac vice anticipated)
17 **CAFFERTY CLOBES MERIWETHER**
& SPRENGEL LLP
18 135 South LaSalle Street, Suite 3210
Chicago, IL 60603
19 Telephone: (312) 782-4880
Email: bclobes@caffertyclobes.com
20 asweatman@caffertyclobes.com
mrathur@caffertyclobes.com

21
22 Daniel J. Muller (State Bar No. 193396)
VENTURA HERSEY & MULLER, LLP
23 1506 Hamilton Avenue
San Jose, California 95125
24 Telephone: (408) 512-3022
Facsimile: (408) 512-3023
25 Email: dmuller@venturahersey.com

26 *Counsel for Individual and Representative Plaintiffs*
27 *and the Proposed Class*

Joseph R. Saveri (State Bar No. 130064)
Cadio Zirpoli (State Bar No. 179108)
Christopher K.L. Young (State Bar No. 318371)
Holden Benon (State Bar No. 325847)
Aaron Cera (State Bar No. 351163)
Margaux Poueymirou (State Bar No. 356000)

JOSEPH SAVERI LAW FIRM, LLP

601 California Street, Suite 1505
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 500-6800
Facsimile: (415) 395-9940
Email: jsaveri@saverilawfirm.com
czirpoli@saverilawfirm.com
cyoung@saverilawfirm.com
hbenon@saverilawfirm.com
acera@saverilawfirm.com
mpoueymirou@saverilawfirm.com

Matthew Butterick (State Bar No. 250953)
1920 Hillhurst Avenue, 406
Los Angeles, CA 90027
Telephone: (323) 968-2632
Facsimile: (415) 395-9940
Email: mb@buttericklaw.com

Bryan L. Clobes (pro hac vice)
Alexander J. Sweatman (pro hac vice)
Mohammed A. Rathur (pro hac vice)
**CAFFERTY CLOBES MERIWETHER
& SPRENGEL LLP**
135 South LaSalle Street, Suite 3210
Chicago, IL 60603
Telephone: (312) 782-4880
Email: bclobes@caffertyclobes.com
asweatman@caffertyclobes.com
mrathur@caffertyclobes.com

*Counsel for Individual and Representative
Plaintiffs and the Proposed Class*

[Additional counsel on signature page]

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

Richard Kadrey, et al.,

Individual and Representative Plaintiffs,

v.

Meta Platforms, Inc.,

Defendant.

Lead Case No. 3:23-cv-03417-VC
Case No. 4:23-cv-06663

**PLAINTIFF ANDREW SEAN GREER'S
SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSES TO
DEFENDANT META PLATFORMS, INC.'S
SECOND SET OF REQUESTS FOR
ADMISSION**

1 **PROPOUNDING PARTIES:** **Defendant Meta Platforms, Inc.**
2 **RESPONDING PARTIES:** **Plaintiff Andrew Sean Greer**
3 **SET NUMBER:** **Two (2)**

4
5 Plaintiff Andrew Sean Greer (“Plaintiff”) hereby amends his responses to Defendant Meta
6 Platforms, Inc.’s (“Defendant” or “Meta”) Second Set of Requests for Admissions (the “Requests” or
7 “RFAs”).

8 **GENERAL OBJECTIONS**

9 1. Plaintiff generally objects to Defendant’s definitions and instructions to the extent they
10 purport to require Plaintiff to respond in any way beyond what is required by the Federal and local
11 rules.

12 2. Plaintiff objects to the Requests to the extent they seek information or materials that are
13 protected from disclosure by attorney-client privilege, the work product doctrine, expert disclosure
14 rules, or other applicable privileges and protections, including communications with Plaintiff’s
15 attorneys regarding the Action.

16 Discovery in this matter is ongoing and Plaintiff reserves the right to amend, modify, or
17 supplement these responses with subsequently discovered responsive information and to introduce and
18 rely upon any such subsequently discovered information in this litigation.

19 **SUPPLEMENTAL OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO INDIVIDUAL REQUESTS**

20 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 18:**

21 Admit that, other than YOUR contention that LLM developers such as Meta should have
22 compensated YOU to allegedly use YOUR ASSERTED WORKS to train large language models, YOU
23 are unaware of any specific licensing opportunity that YOU lost due to the infringement alleged in the
24 COMPLAINT.

25 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 18:**

26 Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for
27 discovery that is irrelevant and/or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it
28 includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. Plaintiff will construe the

terms “You” and “Your” as referring to Plaintiff Andrew Sean Greer. Plaintiff objects to this Request as irrelevant to any claim or defense and disproportional to the status and needs of this case. Plaintiff objects to this Request because it is hypothetical and is not tied to the facts of the case. *See, e.g., Buchanan v. Chi. Transit Auth.*, 2016 WL 7116591, at *5 (N.D. Ill. Dec. 7, 2016) (“Since requests to admit ‘must be connected to the facts of the case, courts do not permit “hypothetical” questions within requests for admission.”); *Fulhorst v. Un. Techs. Auto., Inc.*, 1997 WL 873548, at *3 (D. Del. Nov. 17, 1997) (denying request “asking Plaintiff to admit to infringement in the context of the hypothetical use of its device”); Fed. R. Civ. P. 36 advisory committee’s note to 1946 amendment. There is no way for Plaintiff to know what his licensing opportunities would have been but for Meta’s failure to compensate, let alone other LLM developers. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Plaintiff responds that after a reasonable inquiry, the information known or that can be readily obtained by him is insufficient to enable him to admit or deny.

SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 18:

Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for discovery that is irrelevant and/or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. Plaintiff will construe the terms “You” and “Your” as referring to Plaintiff Andrew Sean Greer. Plaintiff objects to this Request as irrelevant to any claim or defense and disproportional to the status and needs of this case. Plaintiff objects to this Request because it is hypothetical and is not tied to the facts of the case. *See, e.g., Buchanan v. Chi. Transit Auth.*, 2016 WL 7116591, at *5 (N.D. Ill. Dec. 7, 2016) (“Since requests to admit ‘must be connected to the facts of the case, courts do not permit “hypothetical” questions within requests for admission.”); *Fulhorst v. Un. Techs. Auto., Inc.*, 1997 WL 873548, at *3 (D. Del. Nov. 17, 1997) (denying request “asking Plaintiff to admit to infringement in the context of the hypothetical use of its device”); Fed. R. Civ. P. 36 advisory committee’s note to 1946 amendment. There is no way for Plaintiff to know what his licensing opportunities would have been but for Meta’s failure to compensate, let alone other LLM developers. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Plaintiff responds, admit.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 19:

1 Dated: September 19, 2024

By: /s/ Bryan L. Clobes
Bryan L. Clobes

2
3 Joseph R. Saveri (State Bar No. 130064)
Cadio Zirpoli (State Bar No. 179108)
4 Christopher K.L. Young (State Bar No. 318371)
Holden Benon (State Bar No. 325847)
5 Aaron Cera (State Bar No. 351163)
Margaux Poueymirou (State Bar No. 356000)
6 **JOSEPH SAVERI LAW FIRM, LLP**
601 California Street, Suite 1505
7 San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 500-6800
8 Facsimile: (415) 395-9940
Email: jsaveri@saverilawfirm.com
9 czirpoli@saverilawfirm.com
cyoung@saverilawfirm.com
10 hbenon@saverilawfirm.com
acera@saverilawfirm.com
mpoueymirou@saverilawfirm.com

11 Matthew Butterick (State Bar No. 250953)
12 1920 Hillhurst Avenue, 406
Los Angeles, CA 90027
13 Telephone: (323)968-2632
14 Facsimile: (415) 395-9940
Email: mb@buttericklaw.com

15 Bryan L. Clobes (pro hac vice)
16 Alexander J. Sweatman (pro hac vice)
Mohammed A. Rathur (pro hac vice)
17 **CAFFERTY CLOBES MERIWETHER**
& SPRENGEL LLP
18 135 South LaSalle Street, Suite 3210
Chicago, IL 60603
19 Telephone: (312) 782-4880
Email: bclobes@caffertyclobes.com
20 asweatman@caffertyclobes.com
mrathur@caffertyclobes.com

21 Daniel J. Muller (State Bar No. 193396)
22 **VENTURA HERSEY & MULLER, LLP**
1506 Hamilton Avenue
23 San Jose, California 95125
Telephone: (408) 512-3022
24 Facsimile: (408) 512-3023
Email: dmuller@venturahersey.com

25 *Counsel for Individual and Representative Plaintiffs*
26 *and the Proposed Class*
27
28

Joseph R. Saveri (State Bar No. 130064)
Cadio Zirpoli (State Bar No. 179108)
Christopher K.L. Young (State Bar No. 318371)
Holden Benon (State Bar No. 325847)
Aaron Cera (State Bar No. 351163)
Margaux Poueymirou (State Bar No. 356000)
JOSEPH SAVERI LAW FIRM, LLP
601 California Street, Suite 1505
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 500-6800
Facsimile: (415) 395-9940
Email: jsaveri@saverilawfirm.com
czirpoli@saverilawfirm.com
cyoung@saverilawfirm.com
hbenon@saverilawfirm.com
acera@saverilawfirm.com
mpoueymirou@saverilawfirm.com

Matthew Butterick (State Bar No. 250953)
1920 Hillhurst Avenue, 406
Los Angeles, CA 90027
Telephone: (323) 968-2632
Facsimile: (415) 395-9940
Email: mb@buttericklaw.com

Bryan L. Clobes (pro hac vice)
Alexander J. Sweatman (pro hac vice)
Mohammed A. Rathur (pro hac vice anticipated)
**CAFFERTY CLOBES MERIWETHER
& SPRENGEL LLP**
135 South LaSalle Street, Suite 3210
Chicago, IL 60603
Telephone: (312) 782-4880
Email: bclobes@caffertyclobes.com
asweatman@caffertyclobes.com
mrathur@caffertyclobes.com

*Counsel for Individual and Representative
Plaintiffs and the Proposed Class*

[Additional counsel on signature page]

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

Richard Kadrey, et al.,

Individual and Representative Plaintiffs,

v.

Meta Platforms, Inc.,

Defendant.

Lead Case No. 3:23-cv-03417-VC
Case No. 4:23-cv-06663

**PLAINTIFF DAVID HENRY HWANG'S
AMENDED RESPONSES TO DEFENDANT
META PLATFORMS, INC.'S SECOND SET
OF REQUESTS FOR ADMISSION**

1 duplicative in whole or in part of RFAs 8-9, 11, and 13-14. Subject to and without waiving the
 2 foregoing objections, Plaintiff responds as follows: admit.

3 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 11:**

4 Admit that YOU are unaware of consent ever having been given (either by YOU or somebody
 5 so authorized on YOUR behalf) to use of any of YOUR ASSERTED WORKS as training data for
 6 artificial intelligence.

7 **AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 11:**

8 Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for
 9 discovery that is irrelevant and /or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it
 10 includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. As narrowed by the parties,
 11 Plaintiff will construe “You” and “Your” to include Plaintiff individually, and his agents. Plaintiff
 12 objects to this Request as unintelligible and vague as to the term “artificial intelligence” and will
 13 construe that term to mean generative artificial intelligence. Plaintiff further objects to this Request as
 14 duplicative in whole or in part of RFAs 8-10 and 13-14. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing
 15 objections, Plaintiff responds as follows: admit.

16 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 12:**

17 Admit that, other than YOUR contention that LLM developers such as Meta should have
 18 compensated YOU to allegedly use YOUR ASSERTED WORKS to train large language models (see,
 19 e.g., [March 7, 2024 denial of RFA No. 1], YOU are unaware of any lost sales due to the infringement
 20 alleged in the COMPLAINT.

21 **AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 12:**

22 Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for
 23 discovery that is irrelevant and /or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it
 24 includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. As narrowed by the parties,
 25 Plaintiff will construe “You” and “Your” to include Plaintiff individually, and his agents. Plaintiff
 26 objects to the term “lost sales” as vague and ambiguous. Plaintiff further objects to this Request
 27 because it is hypothetical and not tied to the facts of the case. See, e.g., *Buchanan v. Chi. Transit Auth.*,
 2016 WL 7116591, at *5 (N.D. Ill. Dec. 7, 2016) (“Since requests to admit ‘must be connected to the

facts of the case, courts do not permit “hypothetical” questions within requests for admission.”); *Fulhorst v. Un. Techs. Auto., Inc.*, 1997 WL 873548, at *3 (D. Del. Nov. 17, 1997) (denying request “asking Plaintiff to admit to infringement in the context of the hypothetical use of its device”); Fed. R. Civ. P. 36 advisory committee’s note to 1946 amendment. Plaintiff further objects to this Request as duplicative in whole or in part of RFA 15. Further, this Request seeks premature expert opinion. Plaintiffs are still investigating their damages theory. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Plaintiff responds as follows: admit.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 13:

Admit that YOU have no documentary evidence that any PERSON has offered any consideration to YOU for the use of YOUR ASSERTED WORKS to train large language models.

AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 13:

Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for discovery that is irrelevant and/or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. As narrowed by the parties, Plaintiff will construe “You” and “Your” to include Plaintiff individually, and his agents. Plaintiff also objects to the term “documentary evidence” as vague and overbroad because it is not limited to the specific claims and defenses raised in this dispute. Plaintiff further objects to this Request as duplicative in whole or in part of RFAs 8-11, and 14. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Plaintiff responds as follows: admit.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 14:

Admit that YOU have no documentary evidence that any PERSON has actually compensated YOU any consideration for use of YOUR ASSERTED WORKS to train large language models.

AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 14:

Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for discovery that is irrelevant and/or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. As narrowed by the parties, Plaintiff will construe “You” and “Your” to include Plaintiff individually, and his agents. Plaintiff also objects to the term “documentary evidence” as vague and overbroad because it is not limited to the

specific claims and defenses raised in this dispute. Plaintiff further objects to this Request as duplicative in whole or in part of RFAs 8-11, and 13. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Plaintiff responds as follows: admit.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 15:

Admit that, other than YOUR contention that LLM developers such as Meta should have compensated YOU to allegedly use YOUR ASSERTED WORKS to train large language models, YOU are unaware of any documentary evidence that YOU have lost sales of any ASSERTED WORKS due to the infringement alleged in the COMPLAINT.

AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 15:

Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for discovery that is irrelevant and/or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. As narrowed by the parties, Plaintiff will construe “You” and “Your” to include Plaintiff individually, and his agents. Plaintiff also objects to the term “documentary evidence” as being vague and overbroad because it is not limited to the specific claims and defenses raised in this case. Plaintiff further objects to the term “lost sales” as vague and ambiguous. Plaintiff also objects to this Request because it is hypothetical and not tied to the facts of the case. See, e.g., *Buchanan v. Chi. Transit Auth.*, 2016 WL 7116591, at *5 (N.D. Ill. Dec. 7, 2016) (“Since requests to admit ‘must be connected to the facts of the case, courts do not permit “hypothetical” questions within requests for admission.”); *Fulhorst v. Un. Techs. Auto., Inc.*, 1997 WL 873548, at *3 (D. Del. Nov. 17, 1997) (denying request “asking Plaintiff to admit to infringement in the context of the hypothetical use of its device”); Fed. R. Civ. P. 36 advisory committee’s note to 1946 amendment. Plaintiff further objects to this Request as duplicative in whole or in part of RFA 12. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Plaintiff responds as follows: admit.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 16:

Admit that book sales for YOUR ASSERTED WORKS (including through any physical bookstore, on-line bookseller, or any other type of book wholesaler or retailer) have not decreased due to the alleged use of YOUR ASSERTED WORKS to train large language models.

1 Dated: September 6, 2024

By: /s/ Bryan L. Clobes
Bryan L. Clobes

2
3 Joseph R. Saveri (State Bar No. 130064)
4 Cadio Zirpoli (State Bar No. 179108)
5 Christopher K.L. Young (State Bar No. 318371)
6 Holden Benon (State Bar No. 325847)
7 Aaron Cera (State Bar No. 351163)
8 Margaux Poueymirou (State Bar No. 356000)
9 **JOSEPH SAVERI LAW FIRM, LLP**
601 California Street, Suite 1505
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 500-6800
Facsimile: (415) 395-9940
Email: jsaveri@saverilawfirm.com
czirpoli@saverilawfirm.com
cyoung@saverilawfirm.com
hbenon@saverilawfirm.com
acera@saverilawfirm.com
mpoueymirou@saverilawfirm.com

11 Matthew Butterick (State Bar No. 250953)
12 1920 Hillhurst Avenue, 406
13 Los Angeles, CA 90027
14 Telephone: (323)968-2632
15 Facsimile: (415) 395-9940
16 Email: mb@buttericklaw.com

17 Bryan L. Clobes (*pro hac vice*)
18 Alexander J. Sweatman (*pro hac vice*)
19 Mohammed A. Rathur (*pro hac vice anticipated*)
20 **CAFFERTY CLOBES MERIWETHER**
21 **& SPRENGEL LLP**
135 South LaSalle Street, Suite 3210
Chicago, IL 60603
Telephone: (312) 782-4880
Email: bclobes@caffertyclobes.com
asweatman@caffertyclobes.com
mrathur@caffertyclobes.com

22 Daniel J. Muller (State Bar No. 193396)
23 **VENTURA HERSEY & MULLER, LLP**
24 1506 Hamilton Avenue
25 San Jose, California 95125
26 Telephone: (408) 512-3022
27 Facsimile: (408) 512-3023
Email: dmuller@venturahersey.com

*Counsel for Individual and Representative Plaintiffs
and the Proposed Class*

Joseph R. Saveri (State Bar No. 130064)
Cadio Zirpoli (State Bar No. 179108)
Christopher K.L. Young (State Bar No. 318371)
Holden Benon (State Bar No. 325847)
Aaron Cera (State Bar No. 351163)
Margaux Poueymirou (State Bar No. 356000)

JOSEPH SAVERI LAW FIRM, LLP

601 California Street, Suite 1505
San Francisco, California 94108

Telephone: (415) 500-6800

Facsimile: (415) 395-9940

Email: jsaveri@saverilawfirm.com

czirpoli@saverilawfirm.com

cyoung@saverilawfirm.com

hbenon@saverilawfirm.com

acera@saverilawfirm.com

mpoueymirou@saverilawfirm.com

Matthew Butterick (State Bar No. 250953)
1920 Hillhurst Avenue, 406
Los Angeles, CA 90027
Telephone: (323) 968-2632
Facsimile: (415) 395-9940
Email: mb@buttericklaw.com

Bryan L. Clobes (pro hac vice)
Alexander J. Sweatman (pro hac vice)
Mohammed A. Rathur (pro hac vice)
**CAFFERTY CLOBES MERIWETHER
& SPRENGEL LLP**

135 South LaSalle Street, Suite 3210
Chicago, IL 60603

Telephone: (312) 782-4880

Email: bclobes@caffertyclobes.com
asweatman@caffertyclobes.com
mrathur@caffertyclobes.com

*Counsel for Individual and Representative
Plaintiffs and the Proposed Class*

[Additional counsel on signature page]

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

Richard Kadrey, et al.,

Individual and Representative Plaintiffs,

v.

Meta Platforms, Inc.,

Defendant.

Lead Case No. 3:23-cv-03417-VC
Case No. 4:23-cv-06663

**PLAINTIFF DAVID HENRY HWANG'S
SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSES TO
DEFENDANT META PLATFORMS, INC.'S
SECOND SET OF REQUESTS FOR
ADMISSION**

1 **PROPOUNDING PARTIES:** **Defendant Meta Platforms, Inc.**
2 **RESPONDING PARTIES:** **Plaintiff David Henry Hwang**
3 **SET NUMBER:** **Two (2)**

4
5 Plaintiff David Henry Hwang (“Plaintiff”) hereby amends his responses to Defendant Meta
6 Platforms, Inc.’s (“Defendant” or “Meta”) Second Set of Requests for Admissions (the “Requests” or
7 “RFAs”).

8 **GENERAL OBJECTIONS**

9 1. Plaintiff generally objects to Defendant’s definitions and instructions to the extent they
10 purport to require Plaintiff to respond in any way beyond what is required by the Federal and local
11 rules.

12 2. Plaintiff objects to the Requests to the extent they seek information or materials that are
13 protected from disclosure by attorney-client privilege, the work product doctrine, expert disclosure
14 rules, or other applicable privileges and protections, including communications with Plaintiff’s
15 attorneys regarding the Action.

16 Discovery in this matter is ongoing and Plaintiff reserves the right to amend, modify, or
17 supplement these responses with subsequently discovered responsive information and to introduce and
18 rely upon any such subsequently discovered information in this litigation.

19 **SUPPLEMENTAL OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO INDIVIDUAL REQUESTS**

20 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 18:**

21 Admit that, other than YOUR contention that LLM developers such as Meta should have
22 compensated YOU to allegedly use YOUR ASSERTED WORKS to train large language models, YOU
23 are unaware of any specific licensing opportunity that YOU lost due to the infringement alleged in the
24 COMPLAINT.

25 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 18:**

26 Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for
27 discovery that is irrelevant and/or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it
28 includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. Plaintiff will construe the

terms “You” and “Your” as referring to Plaintiff David Henry Hwang. Plaintiff objects to this Request as irrelevant to any claim or defense and disproportional to the status and needs of this case. Plaintiff objects to this Request because it is hypothetical and is not tied to the facts of the case. *See, e.g., Buchanan v. Chi. Transit Auth.*, 2016 WL 7116591, at *5 (N.D. Ill. Dec. 7, 2016) (“Since requests to admit ‘must be connected to the facts of the case, courts do not permit “hypothetical” questions within requests for admission.”); *Fulhorst v. Un. Techs. Auto., Inc.*, 1997 WL 873548, at *3 (D. Del. Nov. 17, 1997) (denying request “asking Plaintiff to admit to infringement in the context of the hypothetical use of its device”); Fed. R. Civ. P. 36 advisory committee’s note to 1946 amendment. There is no way for Plaintiff to know what his licensing opportunities would have been but for Meta’s failure to compensate, let alone other LLM developers. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Plaintiff responds that after a reasonable inquiry, the information known or that can be readily obtained by him is insufficient to enable him to admit or deny.

SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 18:

Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for discovery that is irrelevant and/or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. Plaintiff will construe the terms “You” and “Your” as referring to Plaintiff David Henry Hwang. Plaintiff objects to this Request as irrelevant to any claim or defense and disproportional to the status and needs of this case. Plaintiff objects to this Request because it is hypothetical and is not tied to the facts of the case. *See, e.g., Buchanan v. Chi. Transit Auth.*, 2016 WL 7116591, at *5 (N.D. Ill. Dec. 7, 2016) (“Since requests to admit ‘must be connected to the facts of the case, courts do not permit “hypothetical” questions within requests for admission.”); *Fulhorst v. Un. Techs. Auto., Inc.*, 1997 WL 873548, at *3 (D. Del. Nov. 17, 1997) (denying request “asking Plaintiff to admit to infringement in the context of the hypothetical use of its device”); Fed. R. Civ. P. 36 advisory committee’s note to 1946 amendment. There is no way for Plaintiff to know what his licensing opportunities would have been but for Meta’s failure to compensate, let alone other LLM developers. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Plaintiff responds, admit.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 19:

1 Dated: September 19, 2024

By: /s/ Bryan L. Clobes
Bryan L. Clobes

2
3 Joseph R. Saveri (State Bar No. 130064)
Cadio Zirpoli (State Bar No. 179108)
4 Christopher K.L. Young (State Bar No. 318371)
Holden Benon (State Bar No. 325847)
5 Aaron Cera (State Bar No. 351163)
Margaux Poueymirou (State Bar No. 356000)
6 **JOSEPH SAVERI LAW FIRM, LLP**
601 California Street, Suite 1505
7 San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 500-6800
8 Facsimile: (415) 395-9940
Email: jsaveri@saverilawfirm.com
9 czirpoli@saverilawfirm.com
cyoung@saverilawfirm.com
10 hbenon@saverilawfirm.com
acera@saverilawfirm.com
mpoueymirou@saverilawfirm.com

11 Matthew Butterick (State Bar No. 250953)
12 1920 Hillhurst Avenue, 406
Los Angeles, CA 90027
13 Telephone: (323)968-2632
14 Facsimile: (415) 395-9940
Email: mb@buttericklaw.com

15 Bryan L. Clobes (pro hac vice)
16 Alexander J. Sweatman (pro hac vice)
Mohammed A. Rathur (pro hac vice)
17 **CAFFERTY CLOBES MERIWETHER**
& SPRENGEL LLP
18 135 South LaSalle Street, Suite 3210
Chicago, IL 60603
19 Telephone: (312) 782-4880
Email: bclobes@caffertyclobes.com
20 asweatman@caffertyclobes.com
mrathur@caffertyclobes.com

21 Daniel J. Muller (State Bar No. 193396)
22 **VENTURA HERSEY & MULLER, LLP**
1506 Hamilton Avenue
23 San Jose, California 95125
Telephone: (408) 512-3022
24 Facsimile: (408) 512-3023
Email: dmuller@venturahersey.com

25 *Counsel for Individual and Representative Plaintiffs*
26 *and the Proposed Class*
27
28

Joseph R. Saveri (State Bar No. 130064)
 Cadio Zirpoli (State Bar No. 179108)
 Christopher K.L. Young (State Bar No. 318371)
 Holden Benon (State Bar No. 325847)
 Aaron Cera (State Bar No. 351163)
 Margaux Poueymirou (State Bar No. 356000)
JOSEPH SAVERI LAW FIRM, LLP
 601 California Street, Suite 1505
 San Francisco, California 94108
 Telephone: (415) 500-6800
 Facsimile: (415) 395-9940
 Email: jsaveri@saverilawfirm.com
 czirpoli@saverilawfirm.com
 cyoung@saverilawfirm.com
 hbenon@saverilawfirm.com
 acera@saverilawfirm.com
 mpoueymirou@saverilawfirm.com

Matthew Butterick (State Bar No. 250953)
 1920 Hillhurst Avenue, 406
 Los Angeles, CA 90027
 Telephone: (323) 968-2632
 Facsimile: (415) 395-9940
 Email: mb@buttericklaw.com

Bryan L. Clobes (pro hac vice)
 Alexander J. Sweatman (pro hac vice anticipated)
**CAFFERTY CLOBES MERIWETHER
 & SPRENGEL LLP**
 135 South LaSalle Street, Suite 3210
 Chicago, IL 60603
 Telephone: (312) 782-4880
 Email: bclobes@caffertyclobes.com
 asweatman@caffertyclobes.com

*Counsel for Individual and Representative
 Plaintiffs and the Proposed Class*

[Additional counsel on signature page]

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

Richard Kadrey, et al.,

Individual and Representative Plaintiffs,

v.

Meta Platforms, Inc.,

Defendant.

Lead Case No. 3:23-cv-03417-VC
 Case No. 4:23-cv-06663

**PLAINTIFF RICHARD KADREY'S
 AMENDED RESPONSES TO
 DEFENDANT META PLATFORMS,
 INC.'S SECOND SET OF REQUESTS FOR
 ADMISSION**

objections, Plaintiff responds, admit.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 11:

Admit that YOU are unaware of consent ever having been given (either by YOU or somebody so authorized on YOUR behalf) to use of any of YOUR ASSERTED WORKS as training data for artificial intelligence.

AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 11:

Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for discovery that is irrelevant and /or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. As narrowed by the parties, Plaintiff will construe “You” and “Your” to include Plaintiff individually, and his agents. Plaintiff objects to this Request as unintelligible and vague as to the term “artificial intelligence” and will construe that term to mean generative artificial intelligence. Plaintiff further objects to this Request as duplicative in whole or in part of RFAs 8-10 and 13-14. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Plaintiff responds, admit.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 12:

Admit that, other than YOUR contention that LLM developers such as Meta should have compensated YOU to allegedly use YOUR ASSERTED WORKS to train large language models (see, e.g., [March 7, 2024 denial of RFA No. 1), YOU are unaware of any lost sales due to the infringement alleged in the COMPLAINT.

AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 12:

Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for discovery that is irrelevant and /or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. As narrowed by the parties, Plaintiff will construe “You” and “Your” to include Plaintiff individually, and his agents. Plaintiff objects to the term “lost sales” as rendering this Request vague and ambiguous. Plaintiff further objects to this Request because it is hypothetical and not tied to the facts of the case. See, e.g., *Buchanan v. Chi. Transit Auth.*, 2016 WL 7116591, at *5 (N.D. Ill. Dec. 7, 2016) (“Since requests to admit ‘must be

connected to the facts of the case, courts do not permit “hypothetical” questions within requests for admission.’”); *Fulhorst v. Un. Techs. Auto., Inc.*, 1997 WL 873548, at *3 (D. Del. Nov. 17, 1997) (denying request “asking Plaintiff to admit to infringement in the context of the hypothetical use of its device”); Fed. R. Civ. P. 36 advisory committee’s note to 1946 amendment. Plaintiff further objects to this Request as duplicative in whole or in part of RFA 15. Further, this Request seeks premature expert opinion. Plaintiffs are still investigating their damages theory. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Plaintiff responds, as of today, admit.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 13:

Admit that YOU have no documentary evidence that any PERSON has offered any consideration to YOU for the use of YOUR ASSERTED WORKS to train large language models.

AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 13:

Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for discovery that is irrelevant and/or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. As narrowed by the parties, Plaintiff will construe “You” and “Your” to include Plaintiff individually, and his agents. Plaintiff also objects to the term “documentary evidence” as being vague and overbroad because it is not limited to the specific claims and defenses raised in this dispute. Plaintiff further objects to this Request as duplicative in whole or in part of RFAs 8-11, and 14. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Plaintiff responds, admit.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 14:

Admit that YOU have no documentary evidence that any PERSON has actually compensated YOU any consideration for use of YOUR ASSERTED WORKS to train large language models.

AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 14:

Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for discovery that is irrelevant and/or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. As narrowed by the parties, Plaintiff will construe “You” and “Your” to include Plaintiff individually, and his agents. Plaintiff also

objects to the term “documentary evidence” as being vague and overbroad because it is not limited to the specific claims and defenses raised in this dispute. Plaintiff further objects to this Request as duplicative in whole or in part of RFAs 8-11, and 13. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Plaintiff responds, admit.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 15:

Admit that, other than YOUR contention that LLM developers such as Meta should have compensated YOU to allegedly use YOUR ASSERTED WORKS to train large language models, YOU are unaware of any documentary evidence that YOU have lost sales of any ASSERTED WORKS due to the infringement alleged in the COMPLAINT.

AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 15:

Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for discovery that is irrelevant and/or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. As narrowed by the parties, Plaintiff will construe “You” and “Your” to include Plaintiff individually, and his agents. Plaintiff also objects to the term “documentary evidence” as being vague and overbroad because it is not limited to the specific claims and defenses raised in this dispute. Plaintiff further objects to the term “lost sales” as rendering this Request vague and ambiguous. Plaintiff also objects to this Request because it is hypothetical and is not tied to the facts of the case. See, e.g., *Buchanan v. Chi. Transit Auth.*, 2016 WL 7116591, at *5 (N.D. Ill. Dec. 7, 2016) (“Since requests to admit ‘must be connected to the facts of the case, courts do not permit “hypothetical” questions within requests for admission.’”); *Fulhorst v. Un. Techs. Auto., Inc.*, 1997 WL 873548, at *3 (D. Del. Nov. 17, 1997) (denying request “asking Plaintiff to admit to infringement in the context of the hypothetical use of its device”); Fed. R. Civ. P. 36 advisory committee’s note to 1946 amendment. Plaintiff further objects to this Request as duplicative in whole or in part of RFA 12. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Plaintiff responds, admit.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 16:

Admit that book sales for YOUR ASSERTED WORKS (including through any physical bookstore, on-line bookseller, or any other type of book wholesaler or retailer) have not decreased due

1 Dated: August 28, 2024

By: /s/ Joseph R. Saveri
Joseph R. Saveri

2
3 Joseph R. Saveri (State Bar No. 130064)
4 Cadio Zirpoli (State Bar No. 179108)
5 Christopher K.L. Young (State Bar No. 318371)
6 Holden Benon (State Bar No. 325847)
7 Aaron Cera (State Bar No. 351163)
8 Margaux Poueymirou (State Bar No. 356000)
9 **JOSEPH SAVERI LAW FIRM, LLP**
10 601 California Street, Suite 1505
11 San Francisco, California 94108
12 Telephone: (415) 500-6800
13 Facsimile: (415) 395-9940
14 Email: jsaveri@saverilawfirm.com
15 czirpoli@saverilawfirm.com
16 cyoung@saverilawfirm.com
17 hbenon@saverilawfirm.com
18 acera@saverilawfirm.com
19 mpoueymirou@saverilawfirm.com

20 Matthew Butterick (State Bar No. 250953)
21 1920 Hillhurst Avenue, 406
22 Los Angeles, CA 90027
23 Telephone: (323)968-2632
24 Facsimile: (415) 395-9940
25 Email: mb@buttericklaw.com

26 Bryan L. Clobes (pro hac vice)
27 Alexander J. Sweatman (*pro hac vice anticipated*)
CAFFERTY CLOBES MERIWETHER
& SPRENGEL LLP
135 South LaSalle Street, Suite 3210
Chicago, IL 60603
Telephone: (312) 782-4880
Email: bclobes@caffertyclobes.com
asweatman@caffertyclobes.com

21 Daniel J. Muller (State Bar No. 193396)
22 **VENTURA HERSEY & MULLER, LLP**
23 1506 Hamilton Avenue
24 San Jose, California 95125
25 Telephone: (408) 512-3022
26 Facsimile: (408) 512-3023
27 Email: dmuller@venturahersey.com

*Counsel for Individual and Representative Plaintiffs
and the Proposed Class*

Joseph R. Saveri (State Bar No. 130064)
 Cadio Zirpoli (State Bar No. 179108)
 Christopher K.L. Young (State Bar No. 318371)
 Holden Benon (State Bar No. 325847)
 Aaron Cera (State Bar No. 351163)
 Margaux Poueymirou (State Bar No. 356000)
JOSEPH SAVERI LAW FIRM, LLP
 601 California Street, Suite 1505
 San Francisco, California 94108
 Telephone: (415) 500-6800
 Facsimile: (415) 395-9940
 Email: jsaveri@saverilawfirm.com
 czirpoli@saverilawfirm.com
 cyoung@saverilawfirm.com
 hbenon@saverilawfirm.com
 acera@saverilawfirm.com
 mpoueymirou@saverilawfirm.com

Matthew Butterick (State Bar No. 250953)
 1920 Hillhurst Avenue, 406
 Los Angeles, CA 90027
 Telephone: (323) 968-2632
 Facsimile: (415) 395-9940
 Email: mb@buttericklaw.com

*Counsel for Individual and Representative
 Plaintiffs and the Proposed Class*

[Additional counsel on signature page]

Bryan L. Clobes (*pro hac vice*)
 Alexander J. Sweatman (*pro hac vice*)
**CAFFERTY CLOBES MERIWETHER
 & SPRENGEL LLP**
 135 South LaSalle Street, Suite 3210
 Chicago, IL 60603
 Telephone: (312) 782-4880
 Email: bclobes@caffertyclobes.com
 asweatman@caffertyclobes.com

David A. Straite (*pro hac vice*)
DICELLO LEVITT LLP
 4747 Executive Drive, 2nd Floor
 San Diego, California 92121
 Telephone: (619) 923-3939
 Email: dstraite@dicellolevitt.com

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

Richard Kadrey, et al.,
Individual and Representative Plaintiffs,
 v.
 Meta Platforms, Inc.,
Defendant.

Lead Case No. 3:23-cv-03417-VC
 Case No. 4:23-cv-06663

**PLAINTIFF RICHARD KADREY'S
 AMENDED RESPONSES TO
 DEFENDANT META PLATFORMS,
 INC.'S SECOND SET OF REQUESTS FOR
 ADMISSION**

1 **PROPOUNDING PARTIES:** **Defendant Meta Platforms, Inc.**
2 **RESPONDING PARTIES:** **Plaintiff Richard Kadrey**
3 **SET NUMBER:** **Two (2)**

4
5 Plaintiff Richard Kadrey (“Plaintiff”) hereby amends his responses to Defendant Meta
6 Platforms, Inc.’s (“Defendant” or “Meta”) Second Set of Requests for Admissions (the “Requests”
7 or “RFAs”).

8 **GENERAL OBJECTIONS**

9 1. Plaintiff generally objects to Defendant’s definitions and instructions to the extent they
10 purport to require Plaintiff to respond in any way beyond what is required by the Federal and local rules.

11 2. Plaintiff objects to the Requests to the extent they seek information or materials that are
12 protected from disclosure by attorney-client privilege, the work product doctrine, expert disclosure
13 rules, or other applicable privileges and protections, including communications with Plaintiff’s
14 attorneys regarding the Action.

15 Discovery in this matter is ongoing and Plaintiff reserves the right to amend, modify, or
16 supplement these responses with subsequently discovered responsive information and to introduce and
17 rely upon any such subsequently discovered information in this litigation.

18 **AMENDED OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO INDIVIDUAL REQUESTS**

19 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 18:**

20 Admit that, other than YOUR contention that LLM developers such as Meta should have
21 compensated YOU to allegedly use YOUR ASSERTED WORKS to train large language models, YOU
22 are unaware of any specific licensing opportunity that YOU lost due to the infringement alleged in the
23 COMPLAINT.

24 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 18:**

25 Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for
26 discovery that is irrelevant and/or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it
27 includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. Plaintiff will construe the
28 terms “You” and “Your” as referring to Plaintiff Richard Kadrey. Plaintiff objects to this Request as

irrelevant to any claim or defense and disproportional to the status and needs of this case. Plaintiff objects to this Request because it is hypothetical and is not tied to the facts of the case. *See, e.g., Buchanan v. Chi. Transit Auth.*, 2016 WL 7116591, at *5 (N.D. Ill. Dec. 7, 2016) (“Since requests to admit ‘must be connected to the facts of the case, courts do not permit “hypothetical” questions within requests for admission.’”); *Fulhorst v. Un. Techs. Auto., Inc.*, 1997 WL 873548, at *3 (D. Del. Nov. 17, 1997) (denying request “asking Plaintiff to admit to infringement in the context of the hypothetical use of its device”); Fed. R. Civ. P. 36 advisory committee’s note to 1946 amendment. There is no way for Plaintiff to know what his licensing opportunities would have been but for Meta’s failure to compensate, let alone other LLM developers. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Plaintiff responds that after a reasonable inquiry, the information known or that can be readily obtained by him is insufficient to enable him to admit or deny.

AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 18:

Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for discovery that is irrelevant and/or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. Plaintiff will construe the terms “You” and “Your” as referring to Plaintiff Christopher Golden. Plaintiff objects to this Request as irrelevant to any claim or defense and disproportional to the status and needs of this case. Plaintiff objects to this Request because it is hypothetical and is not tied to the facts of the case. *See, e.g., Buchanan v. Chi. Transit Auth.*, 2016 WL 7116591, at *5 (N.D. Ill. Dec. 7, 2016) (“Since requests to admit ‘must be connected to the facts of the case, courts do not permit “hypothetical” questions within requests for admission.’”); *Fulhorst v. Un. Techs. Auto., Inc.*, 1997 WL 873548, at *3 (D. Del. Nov. 17, 1997) (denying request “asking Plaintiff to admit to infringement in the context of the hypothetical use of its device”); Fed. R. Civ. P. 36 advisory committee’s note to 1946 amendment. There is no way for Plaintiff to know what his licensing opportunities would have been but for Meta’s failure to compensate, let alone other LLM developers. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Plaintiff responds, admit.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 19:

Admit that, other than YOUR contention that LLM developers such as Meta should have

1 Dated: September 19, 2024

By: /s/ Joseph R. Saveri
Joseph R. Saveri

2
3 Joseph R. Saveri (State Bar No. 130064)
4 Cadio Zirpoli (State Bar No. 179108)
5 Christopher K.L. Young (State Bar No. 318371)
6 Holden Benon (State Bar No. 325847)
7 Aaron Cera (State Bar No. 351163)
8 Margaux Poueymirou (State Bar No. 356000)
9 **JOSEPH SAVERI LAW FIRM, LLP**
10 601 California Street, Suite 1505
11 San Francisco, California 94108
12 Telephone: (415) 500-6800
13 Facsimile: (415) 395-9940
14 Email: jsaveri@saverilawfirm.com
15 czirpoli@saverilawfirm.com
16 cyoung@saverilawfirm.com
17 hbenon@saverilawfirm.com
18 acera@saverilawfirm.com
19 mpoueymirou@saverilawfirm.com

20 Matthew Butterick (State Bar No. 250953)
21 1920 Hillhurst Avenue, 406
22 Los Angeles, CA 90027
23 Telephone: (323)968-2632
24 Facsimile: (415) 395-9940
25 Email: mb@buttericklaw.com

26 Bryan L. Clobes (pro hac vice)
27 Alexander J. Sweatman (*pro hac vice anticipated*)
28 **CAFFERTY CLOBES MERIWETHER**
& SPRENGEL LLP
135 South LaSalle Street, Suite 3210
Chicago, IL 60603
Telephone: (312) 782-4880
Email: bclobes@caffertyclobes.com
asweatman@caffertyclobes.com

Daniel J. Muller (State Bar No. 193396)
VENTURA HERSEY & MULLER, LLP
1506 Hamilton Avenue
San Jose, California 95125
Telephone: (408) 512-3022
Facsimile: (408) 512-3023
Email: dmuller@venturahersey.com

Joseph R. Saveri (State Bar No. 130064)
Cadio Zirpoli (State Bar No. 179108)
Christopher K.L. Young (State Bar No. 318371)
Holden Benon (State Bar No. 325847)
Aaron Cera (State Bar No. 351163)
Margaux Poueymirou (State Bar No. 356000)

JOSEPH SAVERI LAW FIRM, LLP

601 California Street, Suite 1505
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 500-6800
Facsimile: (415) 395-9940
Email: jsaveri@saverilawfirm.com
czirpoli@saverilawfirm.com
cyoung@saverilawfirm.com
hbenon@saverilawfirm.com
acera@saverilawfirm.com
mpoueymirou@saverilawfirm.com

Matthew Butterick (State Bar No. 250953)
1920 Hillhurst Avenue, 406
Los Angeles, CA 90027
Telephone: (323) 968-2632
Facsimile: (415) 395-9940
Email: mb@buttericklaw.com

Bryan L. Clobes (pro hac vice)
Alexander J. Sweatman (pro hac vice)
Mohammed A. Rathur (pro hac vice anticipated)
**CAFFERTY CLOBES MERIWETHER
& SPRENGEL LLP**
135 South LaSalle Street, Suite 3210
Chicago, IL 60603
Telephone: (312) 782-4880
Email: bclobes@caffertyclobes.com
asweatman@caffertyclobes.com
mrathur@caffertyclobes.com

*Counsel for Individual and Representative
Plaintiffs and the Proposed Class*

[Additional counsel on signature page]

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

Richard Kadrey, et al.,

Individual and Representative Plaintiffs,

v.

Meta Platforms, Inc.,

Defendant.

Lead Case No. 3:23-cv-03417-VC
Case No. 4:23-cv-06663

**PLAINTIFF MATTHEW KLAM'S
AMENDED RESPONSES TO DEFENDANT
META PLATFORMS, INC.'S SECOND SET
OF REQUESTS FOR ADMISSION**

1 duplicative in whole or in part of RFAs 8-9, 11, and 13-14. Subject to and without waiving the
2 foregoing objections, Plaintiff responds as follows: admit.

3 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 11:**

4 Admit that YOU are unaware of consent ever having been given (either by YOU or somebody
5 so authorized on YOUR behalf) to use of any of YOUR ASSERTED WORKS as training data for
6 artificial intelligence.

7 **AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 11:**

8 Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for
9 discovery that is irrelevant and /or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it
10 includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. As narrowed by the parties,
11 Plaintiff will construe “You” and “Your” to include Plaintiff individually, and his agents. Plaintiff
12 objects to this Request as unintelligible and vague as to the term “artificial intelligence” and will
13 construe that term to mean generative artificial intelligence. Plaintiff further objects to this Request as
14 duplicative in whole or in part of RFAs 8-10 and 13-14. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing
15 objections, Plaintiff responds as follows: admit.

16 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 12:**

17 Admit that, other than YOUR contention that LLM developers such as Meta should have
18 compensated YOU to allegedly use YOUR ASSERTED WORKS to train large language models (see,
19 e.g., [March 7, 2024 denial of RFA No. 1]), YOU are unaware of any lost sales due to the infringement
20 alleged in the COMPLAINT.

21 **AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 12:**

22 Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for
23 discovery that is irrelevant and /or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it
24 includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. As narrowed by the parties,
25 Plaintiff will construe “You” and “Your” to include Plaintiff individually, and his agents. Plaintiff
26 objects to the term “lost sales” as vague and ambiguous. Plaintiff further objects to this Request
27 because it is hypothetical and not tied to the facts of the case. See, e.g., *Buchanan v. Chi. Transit Auth.*,
2016 WL 7116591, at *5 (N.D. Ill. Dec. 7, 2016) (“Since requests to admit ‘must be connected to the

1 facts of the case, courts do not permit “hypothetical” questions within requests for admission.”);
2 *Fulhorst v. Un. Techs. Auto., Inc.*, 1997 WL 873548, at *3 (D. Del. Nov. 17, 1997) (denying request
3 “asking Plaintiff to admit to infringement in the context of the hypothetical use of its device”); Fed. R.
4 Civ. P. 36 advisory committee’s note to 1946 amendment. Plaintiff further objects to this Request as
5 duplicative in whole or in part of RFA 15. Further, this Request seeks premature expert opinion.
6 Plaintiffs are still investigating their damages theory. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing
7 objections, Plaintiff responds as follows: admit.

8 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 13:**

9 Admit that YOU have no documentary evidence that any PERSON has offered any
10 consideration to YOU for the use of YOUR ASSERTED WORKS to train large language models.

11 **AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 13:**

12 Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for
13 discovery that is irrelevant and/or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it
14 includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. As narrowed by the parties,
15 Plaintiff will construe “You” and “Your” to include Plaintiff individually, and his agents. Plaintiff also
16 objects to the term “documentary evidence” as vague and overbroad because it is not limited to the
17 specific claims and defenses raised in this dispute. Plaintiff further objects to this Request as
18 duplicative in whole or in part of RFAs 8-11, and 14. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing
19 objections, Plaintiff responds as follows: admit.

20 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 14:**

21 Admit that YOU have no documentary evidence that any PERSON has actually compensated
22 YOU any consideration for use of YOUR ASSERTED WORKS to train large language models.

23 **AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 14:**

24 Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for
25 discovery that is irrelevant and/or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it
26 includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. As narrowed by the parties,
27 Plaintiff will construe “You” and “Your” to include Plaintiff individually, and his agents. Plaintiff also
objects to the term “documentary evidence” as vague and overbroad because it is not limited to the

specific claims and defenses raised in this dispute. Plaintiff further objects to this Request as duplicative in whole or in part of RFAs 8-11, and 13. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Plaintiff responds as follows: admit.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 15:

Admit that, other than YOUR contention that LLM developers such as Meta should have compensated YOU to allegedly use YOUR ASSERTED WORKS to train large language models, YOU are unaware of any documentary evidence that YOU have lost sales of any ASSERTED WORKS due to the infringement alleged in the COMPLAINT.

AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 15:

Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for discovery that is irrelevant and/or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. As narrowed by the parties, Plaintiff will construe “You” and “Your” to include Plaintiff individually, and his agents. Plaintiff also objects to the term “documentary evidence” as being vague and overbroad because it is not limited to the specific claims and defenses raised in this case. Plaintiff further objects to the term “lost sales” as vague and ambiguous. Plaintiff also objects to this Request because it is hypothetical and not tied to the facts of the case. See, e.g., *Buchanan v. Chi. Transit Auth.*, 2016 WL 7116591, at *5 (N.D. Ill. Dec. 7, 2016) (“Since requests to admit ‘must be connected to the facts of the case, courts do not permit “hypothetical” questions within requests for admission.”); *Fulhorst v. Un. Techs. Auto., Inc.*, 1997 WL 873548, at *3 (D. Del. Nov. 17, 1997) (denying request “asking Plaintiff to admit to infringement in the context of the hypothetical use of its device”); Fed. R. Civ. P. 36 advisory committee’s note to 1946 amendment. Plaintiff further objects to this Request as duplicative in whole or in part of RFA 12. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Plaintiff responds as follows: admit.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 16:

Admit that book sales for YOUR ASSERTED WORKS (including through any physical bookstore, on-line bookseller, or any other type of book wholesaler or retailer) have not decreased due to the alleged use of YOUR ASSERTED WORKS to train large language models.

1 Dated: September 6, 2024

By: /s/ Bryan L. Clobes
Bryan L. Clobes

2
3 Joseph R. Saveri (State Bar No. 130064)
4 Cadio Zirpoli (State Bar No. 179108)
5 Christopher K.L. Young (State Bar No. 318371)
6 Holden Benon (State Bar No. 325847)
7 Aaron Cera (State Bar No. 351163)
8 Margaux Poueymirou (State Bar No. 356000)
9 **JOSEPH SAVERI LAW FIRM, LLP**
601 California Street, Suite 1505
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 500-6800
Facsimile: (415) 395-9940
Email: jsaveri@saverilawfirm.com
czirpoli@saverilawfirm.com
cyoung@saverilawfirm.com
hbenon@saverilawfirm.com
acera@saverilawfirm.com
mpoueymirou@saverilawfirm.com

11 Matthew Butterick (State Bar No. 250953)
12 1920 Hillhurst Avenue, 406
13 Los Angeles, CA 90027
14 Telephone: (323)968-2632
15 Facsimile: (415) 395-9940
16 Email: mb@buttericklaw.com

17 Bryan L. Clobes (pro hac vice)
18 Alexander J. Sweatman (pro hac vice)
19 Mohammed A. Rathur (pro hac vice anticipated)
20 **CAFFERTY CLOBES MERIWETHER**
21 **& SPRENGEL LLP**
135 South LaSalle Street, Suite 3210
Chicago, IL 60603
Telephone: (312) 782-4880
Email: bclobes@caffertyclobes.com
asweatman@caffertyclobes.com
mrathur@caffertyclobes.com

22 Daniel J. Muller (State Bar No. 193396)
23 **VENTURA HERSEY & MULLER, LLP**
1506 Hamilton Avenue
San Jose, California 95125
24 Telephone: (408) 512-3022
25 Facsimile: (408) 512-3023
Email: dmuller@venturahersey.com

26 *Counsel for Individual and Representative Plaintiffs*
27 *and the Proposed Class*

Joseph R. Saveri (State Bar No. 130064)
 Cadio Zirpoli (State Bar No. 179108)
 Christopher K.L. Young (State Bar No. 318371)
 Holden Benon (State Bar No. 325847)
 Aaron Cera (State Bar No. 351163)
 Margaux Poueymirou (State Bar No. 356000)
JOSEPH SAVERI LAW FIRM, LLP
 601 California Street, Suite 1505
 San Francisco, California 94108
 Telephone: (415) 500-6800
 Facsimile: (415) 395-9940
 Email: jsaveri@saverilawfirm.com
 czirpoli@saverilawfirm.com
 cyoung@saverilawfirm.com
 hbenon@saverilawfirm.com
 acera@saverilawfirm.com
 mpoueymirou@saverilawfirm.com

Matthew Butterick (State Bar No. 250953)
 1920 Hillhurst Avenue, 406
 Los Angeles, CA 90027
 Telephone: (323) 968-2632
 Facsimile: (415) 395-9940
 Email: mb@buttericklaw.com

Bryan L. Clobes (pro hac vice)
 Alexander J. Sweatman (pro hac vice)
 Mohammed A. Rathur (pro hac vice)
**CAFFERTY CLOBES MERIWETHER
 & SPRENGEL LLP**
 135 South LaSalle Street, Suite 3210
 Chicago, IL 60603
 Telephone: (312) 782-4880
 Email: bclobes@caffertyclobes.com
 asweatman@caffertyclobes.com
 mrathur@caffertyclobes.com

*Counsel for Individual and Representative
 Plaintiffs and the Proposed Class*

[Additional counsel on signature page]

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

Richard Kadrey, et al.,
Individual and Representative Plaintiffs,
 v.
 Meta Platforms, Inc.,
Defendant.

Lead Case No. 3:23-cv-03417-VC
 Case No. 4:23-cv-06663

**PLAINTIFF MATTHEW KLAM'S
 SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSES TO
 DEFENDANT META PLATFORMS, INC.'S
 SECOND SET OF REQUESTS FOR
 ADMISSION**

PROPOUNDING PARTIES: Defendant Meta Platforms, Inc.
RESPONDING PARTIES: Plaintiff Matthew Klam
SET NUMBER: Two (2)

Plaintiff Matthew Klam (“Plaintiff”) hereby amends his responses to Defendant Meta Platforms, Inc.’s (“Defendant” or “Meta”) Second Set of Requests for Admissions (the “Requests” or “RFAs”).

GENERAL OBJECTIONS

1. Plaintiff generally objects to Defendant’s definitions and instructions to the extent they purport to require Plaintiff to respond in any way beyond what is required by the Federal and local rules.

2. Plaintiff objects to the Requests to the extent they seek information or materials that are protected from disclosure by attorney-client privilege, the work product doctrine, expert disclosure rules, or other applicable privileges and protections, including communications with Plaintiff’s attorneys regarding the Action.

Discovery in this matter is ongoing and Plaintiff reserves the right to amend, modify, or supplement these responses with subsequently discovered responsive information and to introduce and rely upon any such subsequently discovered information in this litigation.

SUPPLEMENTAL OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO INDIVIDUAL REQUESTS

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 18:

Admit that, other than YOUR contention that LLM developers such as Meta should have compensated YOU to allegedly use YOUR ASSERTED WORKS to train large language models, YOU are unaware of any specific licensing opportunity that YOU lost due to the infringement alleged in the COMPLAINT.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 18:

Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for discovery that is irrelevant and/or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. Plaintiff will construe the terms “You” and “Your” as referring to Plaintiff Matthew Klam. Plaintiff objects to this Request as

irrelevant to any claim or defense and disproportional to the status and needs of this case. Plaintiff objects to this Request because it is hypothetical and is not tied to the facts of the case. *See, e.g., Buchanan v. Chi. Transit Auth.*, 2016 WL 7116591, at *5 (N.D. Ill. Dec. 7, 2016) (“Since requests to admit ‘must be connected to the facts of the case, courts do not permit “hypothetical” questions within requests for admission.”); *Fulhorst v. Un. Techs. Auto., Inc.*, 1997 WL 873548, at *3 (D. Del. Nov. 17, 1997) (denying request “asking Plaintiff to admit to infringement in the context of the hypothetical use of its device”); Fed. R. Civ. P. 36 advisory committee’s note to 1946 amendment. There is no way for Plaintiff to know what his licensing opportunities would have been but for Meta’s failure to compensate, let alone other LLM developers. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Plaintiff responds that after a reasonable inquiry, the information known or that can be readily obtained by him is insufficient to enable him to admit or deny.

SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 18:

Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for discovery that is irrelevant and/or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. Plaintiff will construe the terms “You” and “Your” as referring to Plaintiff Matthew Klam. Plaintiff objects to this Request as irrelevant to any claim or defense and disproportional to the status and needs of this case. Plaintiff objects to this Request because it is hypothetical and is not tied to the facts of the case. *See, e.g., Buchanan v. Chi. Transit Auth.*, 2016 WL 7116591, at *5 (N.D. Ill. Dec. 7, 2016) (“Since requests to admit ‘must be connected to the facts of the case, courts do not permit “hypothetical” questions within requests for admission.”); *Fulhorst v. Un. Techs. Auto., Inc.*, 1997 WL 873548, at *3 (D. Del. Nov. 17, 1997) (denying request “asking Plaintiff to admit to infringement in the context of the hypothetical use of its device”); Fed. R. Civ. P. 36 advisory committee’s note to 1946 amendment. There is no way for Plaintiff to know what his licensing opportunities would have been but for Meta’s failure to compensate, let alone other LLM developers. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Plaintiff responds, admit.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 19:

Admit that, other than YOUR contention that LLM developers such as Meta should have

1 Dated: September 19, 2024

By: /s/ Bryan L. Clobes
Bryan L. Clobes

2
3 Joseph R. Saveri (State Bar No. 130064)
Cadio Zirpoli (State Bar No. 179108)
4 Christopher K.L. Young (State Bar No. 318371)
Holden Benon (State Bar No. 325847)
5 Aaron Cera (State Bar No. 351163)
Margaux Poueymirou (State Bar No. 356000)
6 **JOSEPH SAVERI LAW FIRM, LLP**
601 California Street, Suite 1505
7 San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 500-6800
8 Facsimile: (415) 395-9940
Email: jsaveri@saverilawfirm.com
9 czirpoli@saverilawfirm.com
cyoung@saverilawfirm.com
10 hbenon@saverilawfirm.com
acera@saverilawfirm.com
mpoueymirou@saverilawfirm.com

11 Matthew Butterick (State Bar No. 250953)
12 1920 Hillhurst Avenue, 406
Los Angeles, CA 90027
13 Telephone: (323)968-2632
14 Facsimile: (415) 395-9940
Email: mb@buttericklaw.com

15 Bryan L. Clobes (pro hac vice)
16 Alexander J. Sweatman (pro hac vice)
Mohammed A. Rathur (pro hac vice)
17 **CAFFERTY CLOBES MERIWETHER**
& SPRENGEL LLP
18 135 South LaSalle Street, Suite 3210
Chicago, IL 60603
19 Telephone: (312) 782-4880
Email: bclobes@caffertyclobes.com
20 asweatman@caffertyclobes.com
mrathur@caffertyclobes.com

21 Daniel J. Muller (State Bar No. 193396)
22 **VENTURA HERSEY & MULLER, LLP**
1506 Hamilton Avenue
23 San Jose, California 95125
Telephone: (408) 512-3022
24 Facsimile: (408) 512-3023
Email: dmuller@venturahersey.com

25 *Counsel for Individual and Representative Plaintiffs*
26 *and the Proposed Class*
27
28

Joseph R. Saveri (State Bar No. 130064)
Cadio Zirpoli (State Bar No. 179108)
Christopher K.L. Young (State Bar No. 318371)
Holden Benon (State Bar No. 325847)
Aaron Cera (State Bar No. 351163)
Margaux Poueymirou (State Bar No. 356000)
JOSEPH SAVERI LAW FIRM, LLP
601 California Street, Suite 1505
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 500-6800
Facsimile: (415) 395-9940
Email: jsaveri@saverilawfirm.com
czirpoli@saverilawfirm.com
cyoung@saverilawfirm.com
hbenon@saverilawfirm.com
acera@saverilawfirm.com
mpoueymirou@saverilawfirm.com

Matthew Butterick (State Bar No. 250953)
1920 Hillhurst Avenue, 406
Los Angeles, CA 90027
Telephone: (323) 968-2632
Facsimile: (415) 395-9940
Email: mb@buttericklaw.com

Bryan L. Clobes (pro hac vice)
Alexander J. Sweatman (pro hac vice)
Mohammed A. Rathur (pro hac vice anticipated)
**CAFFERTY CLOBES MERIWETHER
& SPRENGEL LLP**
135 South LaSalle Street, Suite 3210
Chicago, IL 60603
Telephone: (312) 782-4880
Email: bclobes@caffertyclobes.com
asweatman@caffertyclobes.com
mrathur@caffertyclobes.com

*Counsel for Individual and Representative
Plaintiffs and the Proposed Class*

[Additional counsel on signature page]

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

Richard Kadrey, et al.,

Individual and Representative Plaintiffs,

v.

Meta Platforms, Inc.,

Defendant.

Lead Case No. 3:23-cv-03417-VC
Case No. 4:23-cv-06663

**PLAINTIFF LAURA LIPPMAN'S
AMENDED RESPONSES TO DEFENDANT
META PLATFORMS, INC.'S SECOND SET
OF REQUESTS FOR ADMISSION**

1 duplicative in whole or in part of RFAs 8-9, 11, and 13-14. Subject to and without waiving the
 2 foregoing objections, Plaintiff responds as follows: admit.

3 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 11:**

4 Admit that YOU are unaware of consent ever having been given (either by YOU or somebody
 5 so authorized on YOUR behalf) to use of any of YOUR ASSERTED WORKS as training data for
 6 artificial intelligence.

7 **AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 11:**

8 Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for
 9 discovery that is irrelevant and /or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it
 10 includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. As narrowed by the parties,
 11 Plaintiff will construe “You” and “Your” to include Plaintiff individually, and her agents. Plaintiff
 12 objects to this Request as unintelligible and vague as to the term “artificial intelligence” and will
 13 construe that term to mean generative artificial intelligence. Plaintiff further objects to this Request as
 14 duplicative in whole or in part of RFAs 8-10 and 13-14. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing
 15 objections, Plaintiff responds as follows: admit.

16 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 12:**

17 Admit that, other than YOUR contention that LLM developers such as Meta should have
 18 compensated YOU to allegedly use YOUR ASSERTED WORKS to train large language models (see,
 19 e.g., [March 7, 2024 denial of RFA No. 1], YOU are unaware of any lost sales due to the infringement
 20 alleged in the COMPLAINT.

21 **AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 12:**

22 Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for
 23 discovery that is irrelevant and /or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it
 24 includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. As narrowed by the parties,
 25 Plaintiff will construe “You” and “Your” to include Plaintiff individually, and her agents. Plaintiff
 26 objects to the term “lost sales” as vague and ambiguous. Plaintiff further objects to this Request
 27 because it is hypothetical and not tied to the facts of the case. See, e.g., *Buchanan v. Chi. Transit Auth.*,
 2016 WL 7116591, at *5 (N.D. Ill. Dec. 7, 2016) (“Since requests to admit ‘must be connected to the

1 facts of the case, courts do not permit “hypothetical” questions within requests for admission.”);
2 *Fulhorst v. Un. Techs. Auto., Inc.*, 1997 WL 873548, at *3 (D. Del. Nov. 17, 1997) (denying request
3 “asking Plaintiff to admit to infringement in the context of the hypothetical use of its device”); Fed. R.
4 Civ. P. 36 advisory committee’s note to 1946 amendment. Plaintiff further objects to this Request as
5 duplicative in whole or in part of RFA 15. Further, this Request seeks premature expert opinion.
6 Plaintiffs are still investigating their damages theory. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing
7 objections, Plaintiff responds as follows: admit.

8 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 13:**

9 Admit that YOU have no documentary evidence that any PERSON has offered any
10 consideration to YOU for the use of YOUR ASSERTED WORKS to train large language models.

11 **AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 13:**

12 Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for
13 discovery that is irrelevant and/or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it
14 includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. As narrowed by the parties,
15 Plaintiff will construe “You” and “Your” to include Plaintiff individually, and her agents. Plaintiff also
16 objects to the term “documentary evidence” as vague and overbroad because it is not limited to the
17 specific claims and defenses raised in this dispute. Plaintiff further objects to this Request as
18 duplicative in whole or in part of RFAs 8-11, and 14. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing
19 objections, Plaintiff responds as follows: admit.

20 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 14:**

21 Admit that YOU have no documentary evidence that any PERSON has actually compensated
22 YOU any consideration for use of YOUR ASSERTED WORKS to train large language models.

23 **AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 14:**

24 Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for
25 discovery that is irrelevant and/or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it
26 includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. As narrowed by the parties,
27 Plaintiff will construe “You” and “Your” to include Plaintiff individually, and her agents. Plaintiff also
objects to the term “documentary evidence” as vague and overbroad because it is not limited to the

specific claims and defenses raised in this dispute. Plaintiff further objects to this Request as duplicative in whole or in part of RFAs 8-11, and 13. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Plaintiff responds as follows: admit.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 15:

Admit that, other than YOUR contention that LLM developers such as Meta should have compensated YOU to allegedly use YOUR ASSERTED WORKS to train large language models, YOU are unaware of any documentary evidence that YOU have lost sales of any ASSERTED WORKS due to the infringement alleged in the COMPLAINT.

AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 15:

Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for discovery that is irrelevant and/or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. As narrowed by the parties, Plaintiff will construe “You” and “Your” to include Plaintiff individually, and her agents. Plaintiff also objects to the term “documentary evidence” as being vague and overbroad because it is not limited to the specific claims and defenses raised in this case. Plaintiff further objects to the term “lost sales” as vague and ambiguous. Plaintiff also objects to this Request because it is hypothetical and not tied to the facts of the case. See, e.g., *Buchanan v. Chi. Transit Auth.*, 2016 WL 7116591, at *5 (N.D. Ill. Dec. 7, 2016) (“Since requests to admit ‘must be connected to the facts of the case, courts do not permit “hypothetical” questions within requests for admission.”); *Fulhorst v. Un. Techs. Auto., Inc.*, 1997 WL 873548, at *3 (D. Del. Nov. 17, 1997) (denying request “asking Plaintiff to admit to infringement in the context of the hypothetical use of its device”); Fed. R. Civ. P. 36 advisory committee’s note to 1946 amendment. Plaintiff further objects to this Request as duplicative in whole or in part of RFA 12. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Plaintiff responds as follows: admit.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 16:

Admit that book sales for YOUR ASSERTED WORKS (including through any physical bookstore, on-line bookseller, or any other type of book wholesaler or retailer) have not decreased due to the alleged use of YOUR ASSERTED WORKS to train large language models.

1 Dated: September 6, 2024

By: /s/ Bryan L. Clobes
Bryan L. Clobes

2
3 Joseph R. Saveri (State Bar No. 130064)
4 Cadio Zirpoli (State Bar No. 179108)
5 Christopher K.L. Young (State Bar No. 318371)
6 Holden Benon (State Bar No. 325847)
7 Aaron Cera (State Bar No. 351163)
8 Margaux Poueymirou (State Bar No. 356000)
9 **JOSEPH SAVERI LAW FIRM, LLP**
601 California Street, Suite 1505
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 500-6800
Facsimile: (415) 395-9940
Email: jsaveri@saverilawfirm.com
czirpoli@saverilawfirm.com
cyoung@saverilawfirm.com
hbenon@saverilawfirm.com
acera@saverilawfirm.com
mpoueymirou@saverilawfirm.com

11 Matthew Butterick (State Bar No. 250953)
12 1920 Hillhurst Avenue, 406
13 Los Angeles, CA 90027
14 Telephone: (323)968-2632
15 Facsimile: (415) 395-9940
16 Email: mb@buttericklaw.com

17 Bryan L. Clobes (*pro hac vice*)
18 Alexander J. Sweatman (*pro hac vice*)
19 Mohammed A. Rathur (*pro hac vice anticipated*)
20 **CAFFERTY CLOBES MERIWETHER**
21 **& SPRENGEL LLP**
135 South LaSalle Street, Suite 3210
Chicago, IL 60603
Telephone: (312) 782-4880
Email: bclobes@caffertyclobes.com
asweatman@caffertyclobes.com
mrathur@caffertyclobes.com

22 Daniel J. Muller (State Bar No. 193396)
23 **VENTURA HERSEY & MULLER, LLP**
24 1506 Hamilton Avenue
25 San Jose, California 95125
26 Telephone: (408) 512-3022
27 Facsimile: (408) 512-3023
Email: dmuller@venturahersey.com

*Counsel for Individual and Representative Plaintiffs
and the Proposed Class*

Joseph R. Saveri (State Bar No. 130064)
Cadio Zirpoli (State Bar No. 179108)
Christopher K.L. Young (State Bar No. 318371)
Holden Benon (State Bar No. 325847)
Aaron Cera (State Bar No. 351163)
Margaux Poueymirou (State Bar No. 356000)

JOSEPH SAVERI LAW FIRM, LLP

601 California Street, Suite 1505
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 500-6800
Facsimile: (415) 395-9940
Email: jsaveri@saverilawfirm.com
czirpoli@saverilawfirm.com
cyoung@saverilawfirm.com
hbenon@saverilawfirm.com
acera@saverilawfirm.com
mpoueymirou@saverilawfirm.com

Matthew Butterick (State Bar No. 250953)
1920 Hillhurst Avenue, 406
Los Angeles, CA 90027
Telephone: (323) 968-2632
Facsimile: (415) 395-9940
Email: mb@buttericklaw.com

Bryan L. Clobes (pro hac vice)
Alexander J. Sweatman (pro hac vice)
Mohammed A. Rathur (pro hac vice)
**CAFFERTY CLOBES MERIWETHER
& SPRENGEL LLP**
135 South LaSalle Street, Suite 3210
Chicago, IL 60603
Telephone: (312) 782-4880
Email: bclobes@caffertyclobes.com
asweatman@caffertyclobes.com
mrathur@caffertyclobes.com

*Counsel for Individual and Representative
Plaintiffs and the Proposed Class*

[Additional counsel on signature page]

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

Richard Kadrey, et al.,

Individual and Representative Plaintiffs,

v.

Meta Platforms, Inc.,

Defendant.

Lead Case No. 3:23-cv-03417-VC
Case No. 4:23-cv-06663

**PLAINTIFF LAURA LIPPMAN'S
SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSES TO
DEFENDANT META PLATFORMS, INC.'S
SECOND SET OF REQUESTS FOR
ADMISSION**

PROPOUNDING PARTIES: Defendant Meta Platforms, Inc.
RESPONDING PARTIES: Plaintiff Laura Lippman
SET NUMBER: Two (2)

Plaintiff Laura Lippman (“Plaintiff”) hereby amends her responses to Defendant Meta Platforms, Inc.’s (“Defendant” or “Meta”) Second Set of Requests for Admissions (the “Requests” or “RFAs”).

GENERAL OBJECTIONS

1. Plaintiff generally objects to Defendant’s definitions and instructions to the extent they purport to require Plaintiff to respond in any way beyond what is required by the Federal and local rules.

2. Plaintiff objects to the Requests to the extent they seek information or materials that are protected from disclosure by attorney-client privilege, the work product doctrine, expert disclosure rules, or other applicable privileges and protections, including communications with Plaintiff’s attorneys regarding the Action.

Discovery in this matter is ongoing and Plaintiff reserves the right to amend, modify, or supplement these responses with subsequently discovered responsive information and to introduce and rely upon any such subsequently discovered information in this litigation.

SUPPLEMENTAL OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO INDIVIDUAL REQUESTS

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 18:

Admit that, other than YOUR contention that LLM developers such as Meta should have compensated YOU to allegedly use YOUR ASSERTED WORKS to train large language models, YOU are unaware of any specific licensing opportunity that YOU lost due to the infringement alleged in the COMPLAINT.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 18:

Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for discovery that is irrelevant and/or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. Plaintiff will construe the

terms “You” and “Your” as referring to Plaintiff Laura Lippman. Plaintiff objects to this Request as irrelevant to any claim or defense and disproportional to the status and needs of this case. Plaintiff objects to this Request because it is hypothetical and is not tied to the facts of the case. *See, e.g., Buchanan v. Chi. Transit Auth.*, 2016 WL 7116591, at *5 (N.D. Ill. Dec. 7, 2016) (“Since requests to admit ‘must be connected to the facts of the case, courts do not permit “hypothetical” questions within requests for admission.”); *Fulhorst v. Un. Techs. Auto., Inc.*, 1997 WL 873548, at *3 (D. Del. Nov. 17, 1997) (denying request “asking Plaintiff to admit to infringement in the context of the hypothetical use of its device”); Fed. R. Civ. P. 36 advisory committee’s note to 1946 amendment. There is no way for Plaintiff to know what her licensing opportunities would have been but for Meta’s failure to compensate, let alone other LLM developers. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Plaintiff responds that after a reasonable inquiry, the information known or that can be readily obtained by her is insufficient to enable her to admit or deny.

SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 18:

Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for discovery that is irrelevant and/or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. Plaintiff will construe the terms “You” and “Your” as referring to Plaintiff Laura Lippman. Plaintiff objects to this Request as irrelevant to any claim or defense and disproportional to the status and needs of this case. Plaintiff objects to this Request because it is hypothetical and is not tied to the facts of the case. *See, e.g., Buchanan v. Chi. Transit Auth.*, 2016 WL 7116591, at *5 (N.D. Ill. Dec. 7, 2016) (“Since requests to admit ‘must be connected to the facts of the case, courts do not permit “hypothetical” questions within requests for admission.”); *Fulhorst v. Un. Techs. Auto., Inc.*, 1997 WL 873548, at *3 (D. Del. Nov. 17, 1997) (denying request “asking Plaintiff to admit to infringement in the context of the hypothetical use of its device”); Fed. R. Civ. P. 36 advisory committee’s note to 1946 amendment. There is no way for Plaintiff to know what her licensing opportunities would have been but for Meta’s failure to compensate, let alone other LLM developers. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Plaintiff responds, admit.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 19:

1 Dated: September 19, 2024

By: /s/ Bryan L. Clobes
Bryan L. Clobes

2
3 Joseph R. Saveri (State Bar No. 130064)
Cadio Zirpoli (State Bar No. 179108)
4 Christopher K.L. Young (State Bar No. 318371)
Holden Benon (State Bar No. 325847)
5 Aaron Cera (State Bar No. 351163)
Margaux Poueymirou (State Bar No. 356000)
6 **JOSEPH SAVERI LAW FIRM, LLP**
601 California Street, Suite 1505
7 San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 500-6800
8 Facsimile: (415) 395-9940
Email: jsaveri@saverilawfirm.com
9 czirpoli@saverilawfirm.com
cyoung@saverilawfirm.com
10 hbenon@saverilawfirm.com
acera@saverilawfirm.com
mpoueymirou@saverilawfirm.com

11 Matthew Butterick (State Bar No. 250953)
12 1920 Hillhurst Avenue, 406
Los Angeles, CA 90027
13 Telephone: (323)968-2632
14 Facsimile: (415) 395-9940
Email: mb@buttericklaw.com

15 Bryan L. Clobes (pro hac vice)
16 Alexander J. Sweatman (pro hac vice)
Mohammed A. Rathur (pro hac vice)
17 **CAFFERTY CLOBES MERIWETHER**
& SPRENGEL LLP
18 135 South LaSalle Street, Suite 3210
Chicago, IL 60603
19 Telephone: (312) 782-4880
Email: bclobes@caffertyclobes.com
20 asweatman@caffertyclobes.com
mrathur@caffertyclobes.com

21 Daniel J. Muller (State Bar No. 193396)
22 **VENTURA HERSEY & MULLER, LLP**
1506 Hamilton Avenue
23 San Jose, California 95125
Telephone: (408) 512-3022
24 Facsimile: (408) 512-3023
Email: dmuller@venturahersey.com

25 *Counsel for Individual and Representative Plaintiffs*
26 *and the Proposed Class*
27
28

Joseph R. Saveri (State Bar No. 130064)
Cadio Zirpoli (State Bar No. 179108)
Christopher K.L. Young (State Bar No. 318371)
Holden Benon (State Bar No. 325847)
Aaron Cera (State Bar No. 351163)
Margaux Poueymirou (State Bar No. 356000)
JOSEPH SAVERI LAW FIRM, LLP
601 California Street, Suite 1505
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 500-6800
Facsimile: (415) 395-9940
Email: jsaveri@saverilawfirm.com
czirpoli@saverilawfirm.com
cyoung@saverilawfirm.com
hbenon@saverilawfirm.com
acera@saverilawfirm.com
mpoueymirou@saverilawfirm.com

Matthew Butterick (State Bar No. 250953)
1920 Hillhurst Avenue, 406
Los Angeles, CA 90027
Telephone: (323) 968-2632
Facsimile: (415) 395-9940
Email: mb@buttericklaw.com

Bryan L. Clobes (pro hac vice)
Alexander J. Sweatman (pro hac vice anticipated)
**CAFFERTY CLOBES MERIWETHER
& SPRENGEL LLP**
135 South LaSalle Street, Suite 3210
Chicago, IL 60603
Telephone: (312) 782-4880
Email: bclobes@caffertyclobes.com
asweatman@caffertyclobes.com

*Counsel for Individual and Representative
Plaintiffs and the Proposed Class*

[Additional counsel on signature page]

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

Richard Kadrey, et al.,

Individual and Representative Plaintiffs,

v.

Meta Platforms, Inc.,

Defendant.

Lead Case No. 3:23-cv-03417-VC
Case No. 4:23-cv-06663

**PLAINTIFF SARAH SILVERMAN'S
AMENDED RESPONSES TO
DEFENDANT META PLATFORMS,
INC.'S SECOND SET OF REQUESTS FOR
ADMISSION**

objections, Plaintiff responds, admit.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 11:

Admit that YOU are unaware of consent ever having been given (either by YOU or somebody so authorized on YOUR behalf) to use of any of YOUR ASSERTED WORKS as training data for artificial intelligence.

AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 11:

Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for discovery that is irrelevant and /or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. As narrowed by the parties, Plaintiff will construe “You” and “Your” to include Plaintiff individually, and her agents. Plaintiff objects to this Request as unintelligible and vague as to the term “artificial intelligence” and will construe that term to mean generative artificial intelligence. Plaintiff further objects to this Request as duplicative in whole or in part of RFAs 8-10 and 13-14. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Plaintiff responds, admit.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 12:

Admit that, other than YOUR contention that LLM developers such as Meta should have compensated YOU to allegedly use YOUR ASSERTED WORKS to train large language models (see, e.g., [March 7, 2024 denial of RFA No. 1), YOU are unaware of any lost sales due to the infringement alleged in the COMPLAINT.

AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 12:

Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for discovery that is irrelevant and /or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. As narrowed by the parties, Plaintiff will construe “You” and “Your” to include Plaintiff individually, and her agents. Plaintiff objects to the term “lost sales” as rendering this Request vague and ambiguous. Plaintiff further objects to this Request because it is hypothetical and not tied to the facts of the case. See, e.g., *Buchanan v. Chi. Transit Auth.*, 2016 WL 7116591, at *5 (N.D. Ill. Dec. 7, 2016) (“Since requests to admit ‘must be

1 connected to the facts of the case, courts do not permit “hypothetical” questions within requests for
2 admission.’”); *Fulhorst v. Un. Techs. Auto., Inc.*, 1997 WL 873548, at *3 (D. Del. Nov. 17, 1997)
3 (denying request “asking Plaintiff to admit to infringement in the context of the hypothetical use of its
4 device”); Fed. R. Civ. P. 36 advisory committee’s note to 1946 amendment. Plaintiff further objects to
5 this Request as duplicative in whole or in part of RFA 15. Further, this Request seeks premature expert
6 opinion. Plaintiffs are still investigating their damages theory. Subject to and without waiving the
7 foregoing objections, Plaintiff responds, as of today, admit.

8 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 13:**

9 Admit that YOU have no documentary evidence that any PERSON has offered any
10 consideration to YOU for the use of YOUR ASSERTED WORKS to train large language models.

11 **AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 13:**

12 Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for
13 discovery that is irrelevant and/or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it
14 includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. As narrowed by the parties,
15 Plaintiff will construe “You” and “Your” to include Plaintiff individually, and her agents. Plaintiff also
16 objects to the term “documentary evidence” as being vague and overbroad because it is not limited to
17 the specific claims and defenses raised in this dispute. Plaintiff further objects to this Request as
18 duplicative in whole or in part of RFAs 8-11, and 14. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing
19 objections, Plaintiff responds, admit.

20 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 14:**

21 Admit that YOU have no documentary evidence that any PERSON has actually compensated
22 YOU any consideration for use of YOUR ASSERTED WORKS to train large language models.

23 **AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 14:**

24 Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for
25 discovery that is irrelevant and/or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it
26 includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. As narrowed by the parties,
27 Plaintiff will construe “You” and “Your” to include Plaintiff individually, and her agents. Plaintiff also

objects to the term “documentary evidence” as being vague and overbroad because it is not limited to the specific claims and defenses raised in this dispute. Plaintiff further objects to this Request as duplicative in whole or in part of RFAs 8-11, and 13. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Plaintiff responds, admit.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 15:

Admit that, other than YOUR contention that LLM developers such as Meta should have compensated YOU to allegedly use YOUR ASSERTED WORKS to train large language models, YOU are unaware of any documentary evidence that YOU have lost sales of any ASSERTED WORKS due to the infringement alleged in the COMPLAINT.

AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 15:

Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for discovery that is irrelevant and/or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. As narrowed by the parties, Plaintiff will construe “You” and “Your” to include Plaintiff individually, and her agents. Plaintiff also objects to the term “documentary evidence” as being vague and overbroad because it is not limited to the specific claims and defenses raised in this dispute. Plaintiff further objects to the term “lost sales” as rendering this Request vague and ambiguous. Plaintiff also objects to this Request because it is hypothetical and is not tied to the facts of the case. See, e.g., *Buchanan v. Chi. Transit Auth.*, 2016 WL 7116591, at *5 (N.D. Ill. Dec. 7, 2016) (“Since requests to admit ‘must be connected to the facts of the case, courts do not permit “hypothetical” questions within requests for admission.’”); *Fulhorst v. Un. Techs. Auto., Inc.*, 1997 WL 873548, at *3 (D. Del. Nov. 17, 1997) (denying request “asking Plaintiff to admit to infringement in the context of the hypothetical use of its device”); Fed. R. Civ. P. 36 advisory committee’s note to 1946 amendment. Plaintiff further objects to this Request as duplicative in whole or in part of RFA 12. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Plaintiff responds, admit.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 16:

Admit that book sales for YOUR ASSERTED WORKS (including through any physical bookstore, on-line bookseller, or any other type of book wholesaler or retailer) have not decreased due

Dated: August 28, 2024

By: /s/ Joseph R. Saveri
Joseph R. Saveri

Joseph R. Saveri (State Bar No. 130064)
Cadio Zirpoli (State Bar No. 179108)
Christopher K.L. Young (State Bar No. 318371)
Holden Benon (State Bar No. 325847)
Aaron Cera (State Bar No. 351163)
Margaux Poueymirou (State Bar No. 356000)
JOSEPH SAVERI LAW FIRM, LLP
601 California Street, Suite 1505
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 500-6800
Facsimile: (415) 395-9940
Email: jsaveri@saverilawfirm.com
czirpoli@saverilawfirm.com
cyoung@saverilawfirm.com
hbenon@saverilawfirm.com
acera@saverilawfirm.com
mpoueymirou@saverilawfirm.com

Matthew Butterick (State Bar No. 250953)
1920 Hillhurst Avenue, 406
Los Angeles, CA 90027
Telephone: (323)968-2632
Facsimile: (415) 395-9940
Email: mb@buttericklaw.com

Bryan L. Clobes (pro hac vice)
Alexander J. Sweatman (*pro hac vice anticipated*)
**CAFFERTY CLOBES MERIWETHER
& SPRENGEL LLP**
135 South LaSalle Street, Suite 3210
Chicago, IL 60603
Telephone: (312) 782-4880
Email: bclobes@caffertyclobes.com
asweatman@caffertyclobes.com

Daniel J. Muller (State Bar No. 193396)
VENTURA HERSEY & MULLER, LLP
1506 Hamilton Avenue
San Jose, California 95125
Telephone: (408) 512-3022
Facsimile: (408) 512-3023
Email: dmuller@venturahersey.com

*Counsel for Individual and Representative Plaintiffs
and the Proposed Class*

Joseph R. Saveri (State Bar No. 130064)
 Cadio Zirpoli (State Bar No. 179108)
 Christopher K.L. Young (State Bar No. 318371)
 Holden Benon (State Bar No. 325847)
 Aaron Cera (State Bar No. 351163)
 Margaux Poueymirou (State Bar No. 356000)
JOSEPH SAVERI LAW FIRM, LLP
 601 California Street, Suite 1505
 San Francisco, California 94108
 Telephone: (415) 500-6800
 Facsimile: (415) 395-9940
 Email: jsaveri@saverilawfirm.com
 czirpoli@saverilawfirm.com
 cyoung@saverilawfirm.com
 hbenon@saverilawfirm.com
 acera@saverilawfirm.com
 mpoueymirou@saverilawfirm.com

Matthew Butterick (State Bar No. 250953)
 1920 Hillhurst Avenue, 406
 Los Angeles, CA 90027
 Telephone: (323) 968-2632
 Facsimile: (415) 395-9940
 Email: mb@buttericklaw.com

*Counsel for Individual and Representative
 Plaintiffs and the Proposed Class*

[Additional counsel on signature page]

Bryan L. Clobes (*pro hac vice*)
 Alexander J. Sweatman (*pro hac vice*)
**CAFFERTY CLOBES MERIWETHER
 & SPRENGEL LLP**
 135 South LaSalle Street, Suite 3210
 Chicago, IL 60603
 Telephone: (312) 782-4880
 Email: bclobes@caffertyclobes.com
 asweatman@caffertyclobes.com

David A. Straite (*pro hac vice*)
DICELLO LEVITT LLP
 4747 Executive Drive, 2nd Floor
 San Diego, California 92121
 Telephone: (619) 923-3939
 Email: dstraite@dicellolevitt.com

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

Richard Kadrey, et al.,
Individual and Representative Plaintiffs,
 v.
 Meta Platforms, Inc.,
Defendant.

Lead Case No. 3:23-cv-03417-VC
 Case No. 4:23-cv-06663

**PLAINTIFF SARAH SILVERMAN'S
 AMENDED RESPONSES TO
 DEFENDANT META PLATFORMS,
 INC.'S SECOND SET OF REQUESTS FOR
 ADMISSION**

PROPOUNDING PARTIES: Defendant Meta Platforms, Inc.
RESPONDING PARTIES: Plaintiff Sarah Silverman
SET NUMBER: Two (2)

Plaintiff Sarah Silverman (“Plaintiff”) hereby amends his responses to Defendant Meta Platforms, Inc.’s (“Defendant” or “Meta”) Second Set of Requests for Admissions (the “Requests” or “RFAs”).

GENERAL OBJECTIONS

1. Plaintiff generally objects to Defendant’s definitions and instructions to the extent they purport to require Plaintiff to respond in any way beyond what is required by the Federal and local rules.

2. Plaintiff objects to the Requests to the extent they seek information or materials that are protected from disclosure by attorney-client privilege, the work product doctrine, expert disclosure rules, or other applicable privileges and protections, including communications with Plaintiff’s attorneys regarding the Action.

Discovery in this matter is ongoing and Plaintiff reserves the right to amend, modify, or supplement these responses with subsequently discovered responsive information and to introduce and rely upon any such subsequently discovered information in this litigation.

AMENDED OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO INDIVIDUAL REQUESTS

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 18:

Admit that, other than YOUR contention that LLM developers such as Meta should have compensated YOU to allegedly use YOUR ASSERTED WORKS to train large language models, YOU are unaware of any specific licensing opportunity that YOU lost due to the infringement alleged in the COMPLAINT.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 18:

Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for discovery that is irrelevant and/or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. Plaintiff will construe the terms “You” and “Your” as referring to Plaintiff Sarah Silverman. Plaintiff objects to this Request as

irrelevant to any claim or defense and disproportional to the status and needs of this case. Plaintiff objects to this Request because it is hypothetical and is not tied to the facts of the case. *See, e.g., Buchanan v. Chi. Transit Auth.*, 2016 WL 7116591, at *5 (N.D. Ill. Dec. 7, 2016) (“Since requests to admit ‘must be connected to the facts of the case, courts do not permit “hypothetical” questions within requests for admission.’”); *Fulhorst v. Un. Techs. Auto., Inc.*, 1997 WL 873548, at *3 (D. Del. Nov. 17, 1997) (denying request “asking Plaintiff to admit to infringement in the context of the hypothetical use of its device”); Fed. R. Civ. P. 36 advisory committee’s note to 1946 amendment. There is no way for Plaintiff to know what her licensing opportunities would have been but for Meta’s failure to compensate Plaintiff, let alone other LLM developers. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Plaintiff responds that after a reasonable inquiry, the information known or that can be readily obtained by her is insufficient to enable her to admit or deny.

AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 18:

Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for discovery that is irrelevant and/or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. Plaintiff will construe the terms “You” and “Your” as referring to Plaintiff Christopher Golden. Plaintiff objects to this Request as irrelevant to any claim or defense and disproportional to the status and needs of this case. Plaintiff objects to this Request because it is hypothetical and is not tied to the facts of the case. *See, e.g., Buchanan v. Chi. Transit Auth.*, 2016 WL 7116591, at *5 (N.D. Ill. Dec. 7, 2016) (“Since requests to admit ‘must be connected to the facts of the case, courts do not permit “hypothetical” questions within requests for admission.’”); *Fulhorst v. Un. Techs. Auto., Inc.*, 1997 WL 873548, at *3 (D. Del. Nov. 17, 1997) (denying request “asking Plaintiff to admit to infringement in the context of the hypothetical use of its device”); Fed. R. Civ. P. 36 advisory committee’s note to 1946 amendment. There is no way for Plaintiff to know what his licensing opportunities would have been but for Meta’s failure to compensate, let alone other LLM developers. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Plaintiff responds, admit.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 19:

Admit that, other than YOUR contention that LLM developers such as Meta should have

1 Dated: September 19, 2024

By: /s/ Joseph R. Saveri
Joseph R. Saveri

2
3 Joseph R. Saveri (State Bar No. 130064)
4 Cadio Zirpoli (State Bar No. 179108)
5 Christopher K.L. Young (State Bar No. 318371)
6 Holden Benon (State Bar No. 325847)
7 Aaron Cera (State Bar No. 351163)
8 Margaux Poueymirou (State Bar No. 356000)
9 **JOSEPH SAVERI LAW FIRM, LLP**
10 601 California Street, Suite 1505
11 San Francisco, California 94108
12 Telephone: (415) 500-6800
13 Facsimile: (415) 395-9940
14 Email: jsaveri@saverilawfirm.com
15 czirpoli@saverilawfirm.com
16 cyoung@saverilawfirm.com
17 hbenon@saverilawfirm.com
18 acera@saverilawfirm.com
19 mpoueymirou@saverilawfirm.com

20
21 Matthew Butterick (State Bar No. 250953)
22 1920 Hillhurst Avenue, 406
23 Los Angeles, CA 90027
24 Telephone: (323)968-2632
25 Facsimile: (415) 395-9940
26 Email: mb@buttericklaw.com

27
28 Bryan L. Clobes (pro hac vice)
Alexander J. Sweatman (*pro hac vice anticipated*)
**CAFFERTY CLOBES MERIWETHER
& SPRENGEL LLP**
135 South LaSalle Street, Suite 3210
Chicago, IL 60603
Telephone: (312) 782-4880
Email: bclobes@caffertyclobes.com
asweatman@caffertyclobes.com

Daniel J. Muller (State Bar No. 193396)
VENTURA HERSEY & MULLER, LLP
1506 Hamilton Avenue
San Jose, California 95125
Telephone: (408) 512-3022
Facsimile: (408) 512-3023
Email: dmuller@venturahersey.com

Joseph R. Saveri (State Bar No. 130064)
Cadio Zirpoli (State Bar No. 179108)
Christopher K.L. Young (State Bar No. 318371)
Holden Benon (State Bar No. 325847)
Aaron Cera (State Bar No. 351163)
Margaux Poueymirou (State Bar No. 356000)
JOSEPH SAVERI LAW FIRM, LLP
601 California Street, Suite 1505
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 500-6800
Facsimile: (415) 395-9940
Email: jsaveri@saverilawfirm.com
czirpoli@saverilawfirm.com
cyoung@saverilawfirm.com
hbenon@saverilawfirm.com
acera@saverilawfirm.com
mpoueymirou@saverilawfirm.com

Matthew Butterick (State Bar No. 250953)
1920 Hillhurst Avenue, 406
Los Angeles, CA 90027
Telephone: (323) 968-2632
Facsimile: (415) 395-9940
Email: mb@buttericklaw.com

Bryan L. Clobes (pro hac vice)
Alexander J. Sweatman (pro hac vice)
Mohammed A. Rathur (pro hac vice anticipated)
**CAFFERTY CLOBES MERIWETHER
& SPRENGEL LLP**
135 South LaSalle Street, Suite 3210
Chicago, IL 60603
Telephone: (312) 782-4880
Email: bclobes@caffertyclobes.com
asweatman@caffertyclobes.com
mrathur@caffertyclobes.com

*Counsel for Individual and Representative
Plaintiffs and the Proposed Class*

[Additional counsel on signature page]

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

Richard Kadrey, et al.,

Individual and Representative Plaintiffs,

v.

Meta Platforms, Inc.,

Defendant.

Lead Case No. 3:23-cv-03417-VC
Case No. 4:23-cv-06663

**PLAINTIFF RACHEL LOUISE SNYDER'S
AMENDED RESPONSES TO DEFENDANT
META PLATFORMS, INC.'S SECOND SET
OF REQUESTS FOR ADMISSION**

1 duplicative in whole or in part of RFAs 8-9, 11, and 13-14. Subject to and without waiving the
 2 foregoing objections, Plaintiff responds as follows: admit.

3 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 11:**

4 Admit that YOU are unaware of consent ever having been given (either by YOU or somebody
 5 so authorized on YOUR behalf) to use of any of YOUR ASSERTED WORKS as training data for
 6 artificial intelligence.

7 **AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 11:**

8 Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for
 9 discovery that is irrelevant and /or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it
 10 includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. As narrowed by the parties,
 11 Plaintiff will construe “You” and “Your” to include Plaintiff individually, and her agents. Plaintiff
 12 objects to this Request as unintelligible and vague as to the term “artificial intelligence” and will
 13 construe that term to mean generative artificial intelligence. Plaintiff further objects to this Request as
 14 duplicative in whole or in part of RFAs 8-10 and 13-14. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing
 15 objections, Plaintiff responds as follows: admit.

16 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 12:**

17 Admit that, other than YOUR contention that LLM developers such as Meta should have
 18 compensated YOU to allegedly use YOUR ASSERTED WORKS to train large language models (see,
 19 e.g., [March 7, 2024 denial of RFA No. 1], YOU are unaware of any lost sales due to the infringement
 20 alleged in the COMPLAINT.

21 **AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 12:**

22 Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for
 23 discovery that is irrelevant and /or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it
 24 includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. As narrowed by the parties,
 25 Plaintiff will construe “You” and “Your” to include Plaintiff individually, and her agents. Plaintiff
 26 objects to the term “lost sales” as vague and ambiguous. Plaintiff further objects to this Request
 27 because it is hypothetical and not tied to the facts of the case. See, e.g., *Buchanan v. Chi. Transit Auth.*,
 2016 WL 7116591, at *5 (N.D. Ill. Dec. 7, 2016) (“Since requests to admit ‘must be connected to the

1 facts of the case, courts do not permit “hypothetical” questions within requests for admission.”);
2 *Fulhorst v. Un. Techs. Auto., Inc.*, 1997 WL 873548, at *3 (D. Del. Nov. 17, 1997) (denying request
3 “asking Plaintiff to admit to infringement in the context of the hypothetical use of its device”); Fed. R.
4 Civ. P. 36 advisory committee’s note to 1946 amendment. Plaintiff further objects to this Request as
5 duplicative in whole or in part of RFA 15. Further, this Request seeks premature expert opinion.
6 Plaintiffs are still investigating their damages theory. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing
7 objections, Plaintiff responds as follows: admit.

8 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 13:**

9 Admit that YOU have no documentary evidence that any PERSON has offered any
10 consideration to YOU for the use of YOUR ASSERTED WORKS to train large language models.

11 **AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 13:**

12 Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for
13 discovery that is irrelevant and/or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it
14 includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. As narrowed by the parties,
15 Plaintiff will construe “You” and “Your” to include Plaintiff individually, and her agents. Plaintiff also
16 objects to the term “documentary evidence” as vague and overbroad because it is not limited to the
17 specific claims and defenses raised in this dispute. Plaintiff further objects to this Request as
18 duplicative in whole or in part of RFAs 8-11, and 14. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing
19 objections, Plaintiff responds as follows: admit.

20 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 14:**

21 Admit that YOU have no documentary evidence that any PERSON has actually compensated
22 YOU any consideration for use of YOUR ASSERTED WORKS to train large language models.

23 **AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 14:**

24 Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for
25 discovery that is irrelevant and/or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it
26 includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. As narrowed by the parties,
27 Plaintiff will construe “You” and “Your” to include Plaintiff individually, and her agents. Plaintiff also
objects to the term “documentary evidence” as vague and overbroad because it is not limited to the

specific claims and defenses raised in this dispute. Plaintiff further objects to this Request as duplicative in whole or in part of RFAs 8-11, and 13. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Plaintiff responds as follows: admit.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 15:

Admit that, other than YOUR contention that LLM developers such as Meta should have compensated YOU to allegedly use YOUR ASSERTED WORKS to train large language models, YOU are unaware of any documentary evidence that YOU have lost sales of any ASSERTED WORKS due to the infringement alleged in the COMPLAINT.

AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 15:

Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for discovery that is irrelevant and/or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. As narrowed by the parties, Plaintiff will construe “You” and “Your” to include Plaintiff individually, and her agents. Plaintiff also objects to the term “documentary evidence” as being vague and overbroad because it is not limited to the specific claims and defenses raised in this case. Plaintiff further objects to the term “lost sales” as vague and ambiguous. Plaintiff also objects to this Request because it is hypothetical and not tied to the facts of the case. See, e.g., *Buchanan v. Chi. Transit Auth.*, 2016 WL 7116591, at *5 (N.D. Ill. Dec. 7, 2016) (“Since requests to admit ‘must be connected to the facts of the case, courts do not permit “hypothetical” questions within requests for admission.”); *Fulhorst v. Un. Techs. Auto., Inc.*, 1997 WL 873548, at *3 (D. Del. Nov. 17, 1997) (denying request “asking Plaintiff to admit to infringement in the context of the hypothetical use of its device”); Fed. R. Civ. P. 36 advisory committee’s note to 1946 amendment. Plaintiff further objects to this Request as duplicative in whole or in part of RFA 12. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Plaintiff responds as follows: admit.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 16:

Admit that book sales for YOUR ASSERTED WORKS (including through any physical bookstore, on-line bookseller, or any other type of book wholesaler or retailer) have not decreased due to the alleged use of YOUR ASSERTED WORKS to train large language models.

1 Dated: September 6, 2024

By: /s/ Bryan L. Clobes
Bryan L. Clobes

2
3 Joseph R. Saveri (State Bar No. 130064)
Cadio Zirpoli (State Bar No. 179108)
4 Christopher K.L. Young (State Bar No. 318371)
Holden Benon (State Bar No. 325847)
5 Aaron Cera (State Bar No. 351163)
Margaux Poueymirou (State Bar No. 356000)
6 **JOSEPH SAVERI LAW FIRM, LLP**
601 California Street, Suite 1505
7 San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 500-6800
8 Facsimile: (415) 395-9940
Email: jsaveri@saverilawfirm.com
9 czirpoli@saverilawfirm.com
cyoung@saverilawfirm.com
10 hbenon@saverilawfirm.com
acera@saverilawfirm.com
mpoueymirou@saverilawfirm.com

11 Matthew Butterick (State Bar No. 250953)
12 1920 Hillhurst Avenue, 406
Los Angeles, CA 90027
13 Telephone: (323)968-2632
14 Facsimile: (415) 395-9940
Email: mb@buttericklaw.com

15 Bryan L. Clobes (*pro hac vice*)
16 Alexander J. Sweatman (*pro hac vice*)
Mohammed A. Rathur (*pro hac vice anticipated*)
17 **CAFFERTY CLOBES MERIWETHER**
& SPRENGEL LLP
18 135 South LaSalle Street, Suite 3210
Chicago, IL 60603
19 Telephone: (312) 782-4880
Email: bclobes@caffertyclobes.com
20 asweatman@caffertyclobes.com
mrathur@caffertyclobes.com

21
22 Daniel J. Muller (State Bar No. 193396)
VENTURA HERSEY & MULLER, LLP
23 1506 Hamilton Avenue
San Jose, California 95125
24 Telephone: (408) 512-3022
Facsimile: (408) 512-3023
25 Email: dmuller@venturahersey.com

26 *Counsel for Individual and Representative Plaintiffs*
27 *and the Proposed Class*

Joseph R. Saveri (State Bar No. 130064)
Cadio Zirpoli (State Bar No. 179108)
Christopher K.L. Young (State Bar No. 318371)
Holden Benon (State Bar No. 325847)
Aaron Cera (State Bar No. 351163)
Margaux Poueymirou (State Bar No. 356000)

JOSEPH SAVERI LAW FIRM, LLP

601 California Street, Suite 1505
San Francisco, California 94108

Telephone: (415) 500-6800

Facsimile: (415) 395-9940

Email: jsaveri@saverilawfirm.com

czirpoli@saverilawfirm.com

cyoung@saverilawfirm.com

hbenon@saverilawfirm.com

acera@saverilawfirm.com

mpoueymirou@saverilawfirm.com

Matthew Butterick (State Bar No. 250953)
1920 Hillhurst Avenue, 406
Los Angeles, CA 90027
Telephone: (323) 968-2632
Facsimile: (415) 395-9940
Email: mb@buttericklaw.com

Bryan L. Clobes (pro hac vice)
Alexander J. Sweatman (pro hac vice)
Mohammed A. Rathur (pro hac vice)
**CAFFERTY CLOBES MERIWETHER
& SPRENGEL LLP**

135 South LaSalle Street, Suite 3210
Chicago, IL 60603

Telephone: (312) 782-4880

Email: bclobes@caffertyclobes.com
asweatman@caffertyclobes.com
mrathur@caffertyclobes.com

*Counsel for Individual and Representative
Plaintiffs and the Proposed Class*

[Additional counsel on signature page]

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

Richard Kadrey, et al.,

Individual and Representative Plaintiffs,

v.

Meta Platforms, Inc.,

Defendant.

Lead Case No. 3:23-cv-03417-VC
Case No. 4:23-cv-06663

**PLAINTIFF RACHEL LOUISE SNYDER'S
SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSES TO
DEFENDANT META PLATFORMS, INC.'S
SECOND SET OF REQUESTS FOR
ADMISSION**

Lead Case No. 3:23-cv-03417-VC

PLAINTIFF RACHEL LOUISE SNYDER'S SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSES TO DEFENDANT META PLATFORMS,
INC.'S SECOND SET OF REQUESTS FOR ADMISSION

1 **PROPOUNDING PARTIES:** **Defendant Meta Platforms, Inc.**
 2 **RESPONDING PARTIES:** **Plaintiff Rachel Louise Snyder**
 3 **SET NUMBER:** **Two (2)**

4
 5 Plaintiff Rachel Louise Snyder (“Plaintiff”) hereby amends her responses to Defendant Meta
 6 Platforms, Inc.’s (“Defendant” or “Meta”) Second Set of Requests for Admissions (the “Requests” or
 7 “RFAs”).

8 **GENERAL OBJECTIONS**

9 1. Plaintiff generally objects to Defendant’s definitions and instructions to the extent they
 10 purport to require Plaintiff to respond in any way beyond what is required by the Federal and local
 11 rules.

12 2. Plaintiff objects to the Requests to the extent they seek information or materials that are
 13 protected from disclosure by attorney-client privilege, the work product doctrine, expert disclosure
 14 rules, or other applicable privileges and protections, including communications with Plaintiff’s
 15 attorneys regarding the Action.

16 Discovery in this matter is ongoing and Plaintiff reserves the right to amend, modify, or
 17 supplement these responses with subsequently discovered responsive information and to introduce and
 18 rely upon any such subsequently discovered information in this litigation.

19 **SUPPLEMENTAL OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO INDIVIDUAL REQUESTS**

20 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 18:**

21 Admit that, other than YOUR contention that LLM developers such as Meta should have
 22 compensated YOU to allegedly use YOUR ASSERTED WORKS to train large language models, YOU
 23 are unaware of any specific licensing opportunity that YOU lost due to the infringement alleged in the
 24 COMPLAINT.

25 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 18:**

26 Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for
 27 discovery that is irrelevant and/or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it
 28 includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. Plaintiff will construe the

terms “You” and “Your” as referring to Plaintiff Rachel Louise Snyder. Plaintiff objects to this Request as irrelevant to any claim or defense and disproportional to the status and needs of this case. Plaintiff objects to this Request because it is hypothetical and is not tied to the facts of the case. *See, e.g., Buchanan v. Chi. Transit Auth.*, 2016 WL 7116591, at *5 (N.D. Ill. Dec. 7, 2016) (“Since requests to admit ‘must be connected to the facts of the case, courts do not permit “hypothetical” questions within requests for admission.”); *Fulhorst v. Un. Techs. Auto., Inc.*, 1997 WL 873548, at *3 (D. Del. Nov. 17, 1997) (denying request “asking Plaintiff to admit to infringement in the context of the hypothetical use of its device”); Fed. R. Civ. P. 36 advisory committee’s note to 1946 amendment. There is no way for Plaintiff to know what her licensing opportunities would have been but for Meta’s failure to compensate, let alone other LLM developers. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Plaintiff responds that after a reasonable inquiry, the information known or that can be readily obtained by her is insufficient to enable her to admit or deny.

SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 18:

Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for discovery that is irrelevant and/or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. Plaintiff will construe the terms “You” and “Your” as referring to Plaintiff Rachel Louise Snyder. Plaintiff objects to this Request as irrelevant to any claim or defense and disproportional to the status and needs of this case. Plaintiff objects to this Request because it is hypothetical and is not tied to the facts of the case. *See, e.g., Buchanan v. Chi. Transit Auth.*, 2016 WL 7116591, at *5 (N.D. Ill. Dec. 7, 2016) (“Since requests to admit ‘must be connected to the facts of the case, courts do not permit “hypothetical” questions within requests for admission.”); *Fulhorst v. Un. Techs. Auto., Inc.*, 1997 WL 873548, at *3 (D. Del. Nov. 17, 1997) (denying request “asking Plaintiff to admit to infringement in the context of the hypothetical use of its device”); Fed. R. Civ. P. 36 advisory committee’s note to 1946 amendment. There is no way for Plaintiff to know what her licensing opportunities would have been but for Meta’s failure to compensate, let alone other LLM developers. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Plaintiff responds, admit.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 19:

1 Dated: September 19, 2024

By: /s/ Bryan L. Clobes
Bryan L. Clobes

2
3 Joseph R. Saveri (State Bar No. 130064)
Cadio Zirpoli (State Bar No. 179108)
4 Christopher K.L. Young (State Bar No. 318371)
Holden Benon (State Bar No. 325847)
5 Aaron Cera (State Bar No. 351163)
Margaux Poueymirou (State Bar No. 356000)
6 **JOSEPH SAVERI LAW FIRM, LLP**
601 California Street, Suite 1505
7 San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 500-6800
8 Facsimile: (415) 395-9940
Email: jsaveri@saverilawfirm.com
9 czirpoli@saverilawfirm.com
cyoung@saverilawfirm.com
10 hbenon@saverilawfirm.com
acera@saverilawfirm.com
mpoueymirou@saverilawfirm.com

11 Matthew Butterick (State Bar No. 250953)
12 1920 Hillhurst Avenue, 406
Los Angeles, CA 90027
13 Telephone: (323)968-2632
14 Facsimile: (415) 395-9940
Email: mb@buttericklaw.com

15 Bryan L. Clobes (pro hac vice)
16 Alexander J. Sweatman (pro hac vice)
Mohammed A. Rathur (pro hac vice)
17 **CAFFERTY CLOBES MERIWETHER**
& SPRENGEL LLP
18 135 South LaSalle Street, Suite 3210
Chicago, IL 60603
19 Telephone: (312) 782-4880
Email: bclobes@caffertyclobes.com
20 asweatman@caffertyclobes.com
mrathur@caffertyclobes.com

21 Daniel J. Muller (State Bar No. 193396)
22 **VENTURA HERSEY & MULLER, LLP**
1506 Hamilton Avenue
23 San Jose, California 95125
Telephone: (408) 512-3022
24 Facsimile: (408) 512-3023
Email: dmuller@venturahersey.com

25 *Counsel for Individual and Representative Plaintiffs*
26 *and the Proposed Class*
27
28

David A. Straite (admitted *pro hac vice*)

DiCELLO LEVITT LLP

485 Lexington Ave., Suite 1001

New York, New York 10017

Tel.: (646) 933-1000

Fax: (646) 494-9648

dstraite@dicellolevitt.com

Counsel for Plaintiffs and the Proposed

Class, Additional Counsel Listed Below

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

RICHARD KADREY, SARAH SILVERMAN,
CHRISTOPHER GOLDEN, TA-NEHISI
COATES, JUNOT DÍAZ, ANDREW SEAN
GREER, DAVID HENRY HWANG,
MATTHEW KLAM, LAURA LIPPMAN,
RACHEL LOUISE SNYDER, JACQUELINE
WOODSON, AND LYSA TERKEURST,

Individual and Representative Plaintiffs,

v.

META PLATFORMS, INC.;

Defendant.

Case No. 3:23-cv-03417-VC

**PLAINTIFF LYSA TERKEURST'S
SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSES AND
OBJECTIONS TO DEFENDANT META
PLATFORMS, INC.'S SECOND SET OF
REQUESTS FOR ADMISSION**

Plaintiff Lysa TerKeurst ("Plaintiff") hereby amends her responses to Defendant Meta Platforms, Inc.'s ("Defendant" or "Meta") Second Set of Requests for Admissions (the "Requests" or "RFAs").

GENERAL OBJECTIONS

1. Plaintiff generally objects to Defendant's definitions and instructions to the extent they purport to require Plaintiff to respond in any way beyond what is required by the Federal and local rules.

2. Plaintiff objects to the Requests to the extent they seek information or materials that are protected from disclosure by attorney-client privilege, the work product doctrine, expert

disclosure rules, or other applicable privileges and protections, including communications with Plaintiff's attorneys regarding the Action.

Discovery in this matter is ongoing and Plaintiff reserves the right to amend, modify, or supplement these responses with subsequently discovered responsive information and to introduce and rely upon any such subsequently discovered information in this litigation.

SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSES AND OBJECTIONS TO

REQUESTS FOR ADMISSION

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 12:

Admit that, other than YOUR contention that LLM developers such as Meta should have compensated YOU to allegedly use YOUR ASSERTED WORKS to train large language models (see, e.g., March 7, 2024 denial of RFA No. 1), YOU are unaware of any lost sales due to the infringement alleged in the COMPLAINT.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 12:

Plaintiff objects to the defined terms "You" and "Your" as vague and overbroad and calling for discovery that is irrelevant and/or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. For the purposes of this Request, Plaintiff will construe the terms "You" and "Your" as referring to Plaintiff Lysa TerKeurst. Plaintiff objects to the term "lost sales" as rendering this Request vague and ambiguous. Plaintiff further objects to this Request because it is hypothetical and is not tied to the facts of the case. *See, e.g., Buchanan v. Chi. Transit Auth.*, 2016 WL 7116591, at *5 (N.D. Ill. Dec. 7, 2016) ("Since requests to admit 'must be connected to the facts of the case, courts do not permit 'hypothetical' questions within requests for admission.'"); *Fulhorst v. Un. Techs. Auto., Inc.*, 1997 WL 873548, at *3 (D. Del. Nov. 17, 1997) (denying request "asking Plaintiff to admit to infringement in the context of the hypothetical use of its device"); Fed. R. Civ. P. 36 advisory committee's note to 1946 amendment. Plaintiff further objects to this Request as duplicative in whole or in part of RFA 15. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Plaintiff

admits that she is currently unaware of any lost book sales through retailers caused by the infringement alleged in the Complaint and denies that her lack of awareness has any bearing on whether there have been any such lost sales. Plaintiff otherwise denies Request No. 12.

SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 12

Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for discovery that is irrelevant and/or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. For the purposes of this Request, Plaintiff will construe the terms “You” and “Your” as referring to Plaintiff Lysa TerKeurst and her agent, Meredith Brock. Plaintiff objects to the term “lost sales” as rendering this Request vague and ambiguous. Plaintiff further objects to this Request because it is hypothetical and is not tied to the facts of the case. *See, e.g., Buchanan v. Chi. Transit Auth.*, 2016 WL 7116591, at *5 (N.D. Ill. Dec. 7, 2016) (“Since requests to admit ‘must be connected to the facts of the case, courts do not permit “hypothetical” questions within requests for admission.”); *Fulhorst v. Un. Techs. Auto., Inc.*, 1997 WL 873548, at *3 (D. Del. Nov. 17, 1997) (denying request “asking Plaintiff to admit to infringement in the context of the hypothetical use of its device”); Fed. R. Civ. P. 36 advisory committee’s note to 1946 amendment. Plaintiff further objects to this Request as duplicative in whole or in part of RFA 15. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Plaintiff admits that she is currently unaware of any lost book sales through retailers caused by the infringement alleged in the Complaint and denies that her lack of awareness has any bearing on whether there have been any such lost sales. Plaintiff otherwise denies Request No. 12.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 13:

Admit that YOU have no documentary evidence that any PERSON has offered any consideration to YOU for the use of YOUR ASSERTED WORKS to train large language models.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 13:

Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 15:

Admit that, other than YOUR contention that LLM developers such as Meta should have compensated YOU to allegedly use YOUR ASSERTED WORKS to train large language models, YOU are unaware of any documentary evidence that YOU have lost sales of any ASSERTED WORKS due to the infringement alleged in the COMPLAINT.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 15:

Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for discovery that is irrelevant and/or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. Plaintiff will construe the terms “You” and “Your” as referring to Plaintiff Lysa TerKeurst. Plaintiff also objects to the term “documentary evidence” as being vague and overbroad because it is not limited to the specific claims and defenses raised in this dispute. Plaintiff further objects to the term “lost sales” as rendering this Request vague and ambiguous. Plaintiff also objects to this Request because it is hypothetical and is not tied to the facts of the case. *See, e.g., Buchanan v. Chi. Transit Auth.*, 2016 WL 7116591, at *5 (N.D. Ill. Dec. 7, 2016) (“Since requests to admit ‘must be connected to the facts of the case, courts do not permit “hypothetical” questions within requests for admission.”); *Fulhorst v. Un. Techs. Auto., Inc.*, 1997 WL 873548, at *3 (D. Del. Nov. 17, 1997) (denying request “asking Plaintiff to admit to infringement in the context of the hypothetical use of its device”); Fed. R. Civ. P. 36 advisory committee’s note to 1946 amendment. Plaintiff further objects to this Request as duplicative in whole or in part of RFA 12. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Plaintiff admits that she is currently unaware of any documentary evidence of lost book sales through retailers due to the infringement alleged in the Complaint and denies that her lack of awareness has any bearing on whether any such lost sales have occurred or whether documentary evidence of the same exists. Plaintiff otherwise denies Request No. 15.

SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 15

Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for discovery that is irrelevant and/or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. For the purposes of this Request, Plaintiff will construe the terms “You” and “Your” as referring to Plaintiff Lysa TerKeurst and her agent, Meredith Brock. Plaintiff also objects to the term “documentary evidence” as being vague and overbroad because it is not limited to the specific claims and defenses raised in this dispute. Plaintiff further objects to the term “lost sales” as rendering this Request vague and ambiguous. Plaintiff also objects to this Request because it is hypothetical and is not tied to the facts of the case. *See, e.g., Buchanan v. Chi. Transit Auth.*, 2016 WL 7116591, at *5 (N.D. Ill. Dec. 7, 2016) (“Since requests to admit ‘must be connected to the facts of the case, courts do not permit “hypothetical” questions within requests for admission.”); *Fulhorst v. Un. Techs. Auto., Inc.*, 1997 WL 873548, at *3 (D. Del. Nov. 17, 1997) (denying request “asking Plaintiff to admit to infringement in the context of the hypothetical use of its device”); Fed. R. Civ. P. 36 advisory committee’s note to 1946 amendment. Plaintiff further objects to this Request as duplicative in whole or in part of RFA 12. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Plaintiff admits that she is currently unaware of any documentary evidence of lost book sales through retailers due to the infringement alleged in the Complaint and denies that her lack of awareness has any bearing on whether any such lost sales have occurred or whether documentary evidence of the same exists. Plaintiff otherwise denies Request No. 15.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 16:

Admit that book sales for YOUR ASSERTED WORKS (including through any physical bookstore, on-line bookseller, or any other type of book wholesaler or retailer) have not decreased due to the alleged use of YOUR ASSERTED WORKS to train large language models.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 16:

Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for discovery that is irrelevant and/or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined,

intelligence large language model, for a fee, under certain circumstances. Plaintiff otherwise denies Request No. 33.

SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 33:

Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for discovery that is irrelevant and/or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. Plaintiff will construe the terms “You” and “Your” as referring to Plaintiff Lysa TerKeurst and her agent, Meredith Brock. Plaintiff further objects to the phrase “for a fee” as vague and ambiguous. Plaintiff further objects that Request No. 33 poses an incomplete hypothetical, making a single definitive answer impossible. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Plaintiff admits only that she may be willing to consider permitting a third party to use her asserted works for the purpose of training an artificial intelligence large language model, for a fee, under certain circumstances. Plaintiff otherwise denies Request No. 33.

Dated: September 12, 2024

By: /s/ James A. Ulwick
 Amy Keller (admitted *pro hac vice*)
 Nada Djordjevic (*pro hac vice* forthcoming)
 James A. Ulwick (admitted *pro hac vice*)
 10 North Dearborn St., Sixth Floor
 Chicago, Illinois 60602
 Tel.: (312) 214-7900
 Email: akeller@dicellolevitt.com
 ndjordjevic@dicellolevitt.com
 julwick@dicellolevitt.com

David A. Straite (admitted *pro hac vice*)
 485 Lexington Avenue, Suite 1001
 New York, NY 10017
 Tel. (646) 933-1000
 Email: dstraite@dicellolevitt.com

Brian O’Mara
 4747 Executive Drive, Suite 240
 San Diego, California 92121
 Tel.: (619) 923-3939
 Email: bomara@dicellolevitt.com

David A. Straite (admitted *pro hac vice*)

DiCELLO LEVITT LLP

485 Lexington Ave., Suite 1001

New York, New York 10017

Tel.: (646) 933-1000

Fax: (646) 494-9648

dstraite@dicellolevitt.com

Counsel for Plaintiffs and the Proposed

Class, Additional Counsel Listed Below

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

RICHARD KADREY, SARAH SILVERMAN,
CHRISTOPHER GOLDEN, TA-NEHISI
COATES, JUNOT DÍAZ, ANDREW SEAN
GREER, DAVID HENRY HWANG,
MATTHEW KLAM, LAURA LIPPMAN,
RACHEL LOUISE SNYDER, JACQUELINE
WOODSON, AND LYSA TERKEURST,

Individual and Representative Plaintiffs,

v.

META PLATFORMS, INC.;

Defendant.

Case No. 3:23-cv-03417-VC

**PLAINTIFF LYSA TERKEURST'S
SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSES AND
OBJECTIONS TO DEFENDANT META
PLATFORMS, INC.'S SECOND SET OF
REQUESTS FOR ADMISSION**

Plaintiff Lysa TerKeurst ("Plaintiff") hereby amends her responses to Defendant Meta Platforms, Inc.'s ("Defendant" or "Meta") Second Set of Requests for Admissions (the "Requests" or "RFAs").

GENERAL OBJECTIONS

1. Plaintiff generally objects to Defendant's definitions and instructions to the extent they purport to require Plaintiff to respond in any way beyond what is required by the Federal and local rules.

2. Plaintiff objects to the Requests to the extent they seek information or materials that are protected from disclosure by attorney-client privilege, the work product doctrine, expert

device”); Fed. R. Civ. P. 36 advisory committee’s note to 1946 amendment. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Plaintiff admits that she is currently unaware of a decrease in sales of her book caused by the infringement alleged in the COMPLAINT but denies that her lack of awareness has any bearing on whether such a decrease in sales has occurred or whether documentary evidence of the same exists. Plaintiff otherwise denies Request No. 16.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 18:

Admit that, other than YOUR contention that LLM developers such as Meta should have compensated YOU to allegedly use YOUR ASSERTED WORKS to train large language models, YOU are unaware of any specific licensing opportunity that YOU lost due to the infringement alleged in the COMPLAINT.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 18:

Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for discovery that is irrelevant and/or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. Plaintiff will construe the terms “You” and “Your” as referring to Plaintiff Lysa TerKeurst. Plaintiff objects to this Request as irrelevant to any claim or defense and disproportional to the status and needs of this case. Plaintiff objects to this Request because it is hypothetical and is not tied to the facts of the case. *See, e.g., Buchanan v. Chi. Transit Auth.*, 2016 WL 7116591, at *5 (N.D. Ill. Dec. 7, 2016) (“Since requests to admit ‘must be connected to the facts of the case, courts do not permit “hypothetical” questions within requests for admission.”); *Fulhorst v. Un. Techs. Auto., Inc.*, 1997 WL 873548, at *3 (D. Del. Nov. 17, 1997) (denying request “asking Plaintiff to admit to infringement in the context of the hypothetical use of its device”); Fed. R. Civ. P. 36 advisory committee’s note to 1946 amendment. There is no way for Plaintiff to know what her licensing opportunities would have been but for Meta’s failure to compensate Plaintiff, let alone other LLM developers. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Plaintiff admits that Plaintiff is currently unaware of any specific licensing opportunity that she has lost due to the infringement

alleged in the COMPLAINT, but denies that her lack of awareness has any bearing on whether any such licensing opportunities were lost. Plaintiff otherwise denies Request No. 18.

SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 18

Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for discovery that is irrelevant and/or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. Plaintiff will construe the terms “You” and “Your” as referring to Plaintiff Lysa TerKeurst and her agent, Meredith Brock. Plaintiff objects to this Request as irrelevant to any claim or defense and disproportional to the status and needs of this case. Plaintiff objects to this Request because it is hypothetical and is not tied to the facts of the case. *See, e.g., Buchanan v. Chi. Transit Auth.*, 2016 WL 7116591, at *5 (N.D. Ill. Dec. 7, 2016) (“Since requests to admit ‘must be connected to the facts of the case, courts do not permit “hypothetical” questions within requests for admission.”); *Fulhorst v. Un. Techs. Auto., Inc.*, 1997 WL 873548, at *3 (D. Del. Nov. 17, 1997) (denying request “asking Plaintiff to admit to infringement in the context of the hypothetical use of its device”); Fed. R. Civ. P. 36 advisory committee’s note to 1946 amendment. There is no way for Plaintiff to know what her licensing opportunities would have been but for Meta’s failure to compensate, let alone other LLM developers. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Plaintiff responds, admit.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 19:

Admit that, other than YOUR contention that LLM developers such as Meta should have compensated YOU to allegedly use YOUR ASSERTED WORKS to train large language models, YOU are unaware of any documentary evidence that YOU lost a specific licensing opportunity due to the infringement alleged in the COMPLAINT.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 19:

Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for discovery that is irrelevant and/or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined,

intelligence large language model, for a fee, under certain circumstances. Plaintiff otherwise denies Request No. 33.

SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 33:

Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for discovery that is irrelevant and/or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. Plaintiff will construe the terms “You” and “Your” as referring to Plaintiff Lysa TerKeurst and her agent, Meredith Brock. Plaintiff further objects to the phrase “for a fee” as vague and ambiguous. Plaintiff further objects that Request No. 33 poses an incomplete hypothetical, making a single definitive answer impossible. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Plaintiff admits only that she may be willing to consider permitting a third party to use her asserted works for the purpose of training an artificial intelligence large language model, for a fee, under certain circumstances. Plaintiff otherwise denies Request No. 33.

Dated: September 12, 2024

By: /s/ James A. Ulwick
 Amy Keller (admitted *pro hac vice*)
 Nada Djordjevic (*pro hac vice* forthcoming)
 James A. Ulwick (admitted *pro hac vice*)
 10 North Dearborn St., Sixth Floor
 Chicago, Illinois 60602
 Tel.: (312) 214-7900
 Email: akeller@dicellolevitt.com
 ndjordjevic@dicellolevitt.com
 julwick@dicellolevitt.com

David A. Straite (admitted *pro hac vice*)
 485 Lexington Avenue, Suite 1001
 New York, NY 10017
 Tel. (646) 933-1000
 Email: dstraite@dicellolevitt.com

Brian O’Mara
 4747 Executive Drive, Suite 240
 San Diego, California 92121
 Tel.: (619) 923-3939
 Email: bomara@dicellolevitt.com

Joseph R. Saveri (State Bar No. 130064)
Cadio Zirpoli (State Bar No. 179108)
Christopher K.L. Young (State Bar No. 318371)
Holden Benon (State Bar No. 325847)
Aaron Cera (State Bar No. 351163)
Margaux Poueymirou (State Bar No. 356000)
JOSEPH SAVERI LAW FIRM, LLP
601 California Street, Suite 1505
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 500-6800
Facsimile: (415) 395-9940
Email: jsaveri@saverilawfirm.com
czirpoli@saverilawfirm.com
cyoung@saverilawfirm.com
hbenon@saverilawfirm.com
acera@saverilawfirm.com
mpoueymirou@saverilawfirm.com

Matthew Butterick (State Bar No. 250953)
1920 Hillhurst Avenue, 406
Los Angeles, CA 90027
Telephone: (323) 968-2632
Facsimile: (415) 395-9940
Email: mb@buttericklaw.com

Bryan L. Clobes (pro hac vice)
Alexander J. Sweatman (pro hac vice)
Mohammed A. Rathur (pro hac vice anticipated)
**CAFFERTY CLOBES MERIWETHER
& SPRENGEL LLP**
135 South LaSalle Street, Suite 3210
Chicago, IL 60603
Telephone: (312) 782-4880
Email: bclobes@caffertyclobes.com
asweatman@caffertyclobes.com
mrathur@caffertyclobes.com

*Counsel for Individual and Representative
Plaintiffs and the Proposed Class*

[Additional counsel on signature page]

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

Richard Kadrey, et al.,

Individual and Representative Plaintiffs,

v.

Meta Platforms, Inc.,

Defendant.

Lead Case No. 3:23-cv-03417-VC
Case No. 4:23-cv-06663

**PLAINTIFF JACQUELINE WOODSON'S
AMENDED RESPONSES TO DEFENDANT
META PLATFORMS, INC.'S SECOND SET
OF REQUESTS FOR ADMISSION**

1 duplicative in whole or in part of RFAs 8-9, 11, and 13-14. Subject to and without waiving the
2 foregoing objections, Plaintiff responds as follows: admit.

3 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 11:**

4 Admit that YOU are unaware of consent ever having been given (either by YOU or somebody
5 so authorized on YOUR behalf) to use of any of YOUR ASSERTED WORKS as training data for
6 artificial intelligence.

7 **AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 11:**

8 Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for
9 discovery that is irrelevant and /or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it
10 includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. As narrowed by the parties,
11 Plaintiff will construe “You” and “Your” to include Plaintiff individually, and her agents. Plaintiff
12 objects to this Request as unintelligible and vague as to the term “artificial intelligence” and will
13 construe that term to mean generative artificial intelligence. Plaintiff further objects to this Request as
14 duplicative in whole or in part of RFAs 8-10 and 13-14. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing
15 objections, Plaintiff responds as follows: admit.

16 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 12:**

17 Admit that, other than YOUR contention that LLM developers such as Meta should have
18 compensated YOU to allegedly use YOUR ASSERTED WORKS to train large language models (see,
19 e.g., [March 7, 2024 denial of RFA No. 1], YOU are unaware of any lost sales due to the infringement
20 alleged in the COMPLAINT.

21 **AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 12:**

22 Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for
23 discovery that is irrelevant and /or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it
24 includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. As narrowed by the parties,
25 Plaintiff will construe “You” and “Your” to include Plaintiff individually, and her agents. Plaintiff
26 objects to the term “lost sales” as vague and ambiguous. Plaintiff further objects to this Request
27 because it is hypothetical and not tied to the facts of the case. See, e.g., *Buchanan v. Chi. Transit Auth.*,
2016 WL 7116591, at *5 (N.D. Ill. Dec. 7, 2016) (“Since requests to admit ‘must be connected to the

facts of the case, courts do not permit “hypothetical” questions within requests for admission.”); *Fulhorst v. Un. Techs. Auto., Inc.*, 1997 WL 873548, at *3 (D. Del. Nov. 17, 1997) (denying request “asking Plaintiff to admit to infringement in the context of the hypothetical use of its device”); Fed. R. Civ. P. 36 advisory committee’s note to 1946 amendment. Plaintiff further objects to this Request as duplicative in whole or in part of RFA 15. Further, this Request seeks premature expert opinion. Plaintiffs are still investigating their damages theory. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Plaintiff responds as follows: admit.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 13:

Admit that YOU have no documentary evidence that any PERSON has offered any consideration to YOU for the use of YOUR ASSERTED WORKS to train large language models.

AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 13:

Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for discovery that is irrelevant and/or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. As narrowed by the parties, Plaintiff will construe “You” and “Your” to include Plaintiff individually, and her agents. Plaintiff also objects to the term “documentary evidence” as vague and overbroad because it is not limited to the specific claims and defenses raised in this dispute. Plaintiff further objects to this Request as duplicative in whole or in part of RFAs 8-11, and 14. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Plaintiff responds as follows: admit.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 14:

Admit that YOU have no documentary evidence that any PERSON has actually compensated YOU any consideration for use of YOUR ASSERTED WORKS to train large language models.

AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 14:

Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for discovery that is irrelevant and/or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. As narrowed by the parties, Plaintiff will construe “You” and “Your” to include Plaintiff individually, and her agents. Plaintiff also objects to the term “documentary evidence” as vague and overbroad because it is not limited to the

specific claims and defenses raised in this dispute. Plaintiff further objects to this Request as duplicative in whole or in part of RFAs 8-11, and 13. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Plaintiff responds as follows: admit.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 15:

Admit that, other than YOUR contention that LLM developers such as Meta should have compensated YOU to allegedly use YOUR ASSERTED WORKS to train large language models, YOU are unaware of any documentary evidence that YOU have lost sales of any ASSERTED WORKS due to the infringement alleged in the COMPLAINT.

AMENDED RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 15:

Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for discovery that is irrelevant and/or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. As narrowed by the parties, Plaintiff will construe “You” and “Your” to include Plaintiff individually, and her agents. Plaintiff also objects to the term “documentary evidence” as being vague and overbroad because it is not limited to the specific claims and defenses raised in this case. Plaintiff further objects to the term “lost sales” as vague and ambiguous. Plaintiff also objects to this Request because it is hypothetical and not tied to the facts of the case. See, e.g., *Buchanan v. Chi. Transit Auth.*, 2016 WL 7116591, at *5 (N.D. Ill. Dec. 7, 2016) (“Since requests to admit ‘must be connected to the facts of the case, courts do not permit “hypothetical” questions within requests for admission.”); *Fulhorst v. Un. Techs. Auto., Inc.*, 1997 WL 873548, at *3 (D. Del. Nov. 17, 1997) (denying request “asking Plaintiff to admit to infringement in the context of the hypothetical use of its device”); Fed. R. Civ. P. 36 advisory committee’s note to 1946 amendment. Plaintiff further objects to this Request as duplicative in whole or in part of RFA 12. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Plaintiff responds as follows: admit.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 16:

Admit that book sales for YOUR ASSERTED WORKS (including through any physical bookstore, on-line bookseller, or any other type of book wholesaler or retailer) have not decreased due to the alleged use of YOUR ASSERTED WORKS to train large language models.

1 Dated: September 6, 2024

By: /s/ Bryan L. Clobes
Bryan L. Clobes

2
3 Joseph R. Saveri (State Bar No. 130064)
Cadio Zirpoli (State Bar No. 179108)
4 Christopher K.L. Young (State Bar No. 318371)
Holden Benon (State Bar No. 325847)
5 Aaron Cera (State Bar No. 351163)
Margaux Poueymirou (State Bar No. 356000)
6 **JOSEPH SAVERI LAW FIRM, LLP**
601 California Street, Suite 1505
7 San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 500-6800
8 Facsimile: (415) 395-9940
Email: jsaveri@saverilawfirm.com
9 czirpoli@saverilawfirm.com
cyoung@saverilawfirm.com
10 hbenon@saverilawfirm.com
acera@saverilawfirm.com
mpoueymirou@saverilawfirm.com

11 Matthew Butterick (State Bar No. 250953)
12 1920 Hillhurst Avenue, 406
Los Angeles, CA 90027
13 Telephone: (323)968-2632
14 Facsimile: (415) 395-9940
Email: mb@buttericklaw.com

15 Bryan L. Clobes (*pro hac vice*)
16 Alexander J. Sweatman (*pro hac vice*)
Mohammed A. Rathur (*pro hac vice anticipated*)
17 **CAFFERTY CLOBES MERIWETHER**
& SPRENGEL LLP
18 135 South LaSalle Street, Suite 3210
Chicago, IL 60603
19 Telephone: (312) 782-4880
20 Email: bclobes@caffertyclobes.com
asweatman@caffertyclobes.com
21 mrathur@caffertyclobes.com

22 Daniel J. Muller (State Bar No. 193396)
23 **VENTURA HERSEY & MULLER, LLP**
1506 Hamilton Avenue
24 San Jose, California 95125
Telephone: (408) 512-3022
25 Facsimile: (408) 512-3023
Email: dmuller@venturahersey.com

26 *Counsel for Individual and Representative Plaintiffs*
27 *and the Proposed Class*

Joseph R. Saveri (State Bar No. 130064)
Cadio Zirpoli (State Bar No. 179108)
Christopher K.L. Young (State Bar No. 318371)
Holden Benon (State Bar No. 325847)
Aaron Cera (State Bar No. 351163)
Margaux Poueymirou (State Bar No. 356000)
JOSEPH SAVERI LAW FIRM, LLP
601 California Street, Suite 1505
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 500-6800
Facsimile: (415) 395-9940
Email: jsaveri@saverilawfirm.com
czirpoli@saverilawfirm.com
cyoung@saverilawfirm.com
hbenon@saverilawfirm.com
acera@saverilawfirm.com
mpoueymirou@saverilawfirm.com

Matthew Butterick (State Bar No. 250953)
1920 Hillhurst Avenue, 406
Los Angeles, CA 90027
Telephone: (323) 968-2632
Facsimile: (415) 395-9940
Email: mb@buttericklaw.com

Bryan L. Clobes (pro hac vice)
Alexander J. Sweatman (pro hac vice)
Mohammed A. Rathur (pro hac vice)
**CAFFERTY CLOBES MERIWETHER
& SPRENGEL LLP**
135 South LaSalle Street, Suite 3210
Chicago, IL 60603
Telephone: (312) 782-4880
Email: bclobes@caffertyclobes.com
asweatman@caffertyclobes.com
mrathur@caffertyclobes.com

*Counsel for Individual and Representative
Plaintiffs and the Proposed Class*

[Additional counsel on signature page]

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

Richard Kadrey, et al.,

Individual and Representative Plaintiffs,

v.

Meta Platforms, Inc.,

Defendant.

Lead Case No. 3:23-cv-03417-VC
Case No. 4:23-cv-06663

**PLAINTIFF JACQUELINE WOODSON'S
SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSES TO
DEFENDANT META PLATFORMS, INC.'S
SECOND SET OF REQUESTS FOR
ADMISSION**

PROPOUNDING PARTIES: Defendant Meta Platforms, Inc.
RESPONDING PARTIES: Plaintiff Jacqueline Woodson
SET NUMBER: Two (2)

Plaintiff Jacqueline Woodson (“Plaintiff”) hereby amends her responses to Defendant Meta Platforms, Inc.’s (“Defendant” or “Meta”) Second Set of Requests for Admissions (the “Requests” or “RFAs”).

GENERAL OBJECTIONS

1. Plaintiff generally objects to Defendant’s definitions and instructions to the extent they purport to require Plaintiff to respond in any way beyond what is required by the Federal and local rules.

2. Plaintiff objects to the Requests to the extent they seek information or materials that are protected from disclosure by attorney-client privilege, the work product doctrine, expert disclosure rules, or other applicable privileges and protections, including communications with Plaintiff’s attorneys regarding the Action.

Discovery in this matter is ongoing and Plaintiff reserves the right to amend, modify, or supplement these responses with subsequently discovered responsive information and to introduce and rely upon any such subsequently discovered information in this litigation.

SUPPLEMENTAL OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO INDIVIDUAL REQUESTS

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 18:

Admit that, other than YOUR contention that LLM developers such as Meta should have compensated YOU to allegedly use YOUR ASSERTED WORKS to train large language models, YOU are unaware of any specific licensing opportunity that YOU lost due to the infringement alleged in the COMPLAINT.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 18:

Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for discovery that is irrelevant and/or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. Plaintiff will construe the

terms “You” and “Your” as referring to Plaintiff Jacqueline Woodson. Plaintiff objects to this Request as irrelevant to any claim or defense and disproportional to the status and needs of this case. Plaintiff objects to this Request because it is hypothetical and is not tied to the facts of the case. *See, e.g., Buchanan v. Chi. Transit Auth.*, 2016 WL 7116591, at *5 (N.D. Ill. Dec. 7, 2016) (“Since requests to admit ‘must be connected to the facts of the case, courts do not permit “hypothetical” questions within requests for admission.”); *Fulhorst v. Un. Techs. Auto., Inc.*, 1997 WL 873548, at *3 (D. Del. Nov. 17, 1997) (denying request “asking Plaintiff to admit to infringement in the context of the hypothetical use of its device”); Fed. R. Civ. P. 36 advisory committee’s note to 1946 amendment. There is no way for Plaintiff to know what her licensing opportunities would have been but for Meta’s failure to compensate, let alone other LLM developers. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Plaintiff responds that after a reasonable inquiry, the information known or that can be readily obtained by her is insufficient to enable her to admit or deny.

SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 18:

Plaintiff objects to the defined terms “You” and “Your” as vague and overbroad and calling for discovery that is irrelevant and/or disproportional to the needs of the case because, as defined, it includes any person asked, hired, retained, or contracted to assist Plaintiff. Plaintiff will construe the terms “You” and “Your” as referring to Plaintiff Jacqueline Woodson. Plaintiff objects to this Request as irrelevant to any claim or defense and disproportional to the status and needs of this case. Plaintiff objects to this Request because it is hypothetical and is not tied to the facts of the case. *See, e.g., Buchanan v. Chi. Transit Auth.*, 2016 WL 7116591, at *5 (N.D. Ill. Dec. 7, 2016) (“Since requests to admit ‘must be connected to the facts of the case, courts do not permit “hypothetical” questions within requests for admission.”); *Fulhorst v. Un. Techs. Auto., Inc.*, 1997 WL 873548, at *3 (D. Del. Nov. 17, 1997) (denying request “asking Plaintiff to admit to infringement in the context of the hypothetical use of its device”); Fed. R. Civ. P. 36 advisory committee’s note to 1946 amendment. There is no way for Plaintiff to know what her licensing opportunities would have been but for Meta’s failure to compensate, let alone other LLM developers. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, Plaintiff responds, admit.

REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 19:

1 Dated: September 19, 2024

By: /s/ Bryan L. Clobes
Bryan L. Clobes

2
3 Joseph R. Saveri (State Bar No. 130064)
Cadio Zirpoli (State Bar No. 179108)
4 Christopher K.L. Young (State Bar No. 318371)
Holden Benon (State Bar No. 325847)
5 Aaron Cera (State Bar No. 351163)
Margaux Poueymirou (State Bar No. 356000)
6 **JOSEPH SAVERI LAW FIRM, LLP**
601 California Street, Suite 1505
7 San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 500-6800
8 Facsimile: (415) 395-9940
Email: jsaveri@saverilawfirm.com
9 czirpoli@saverilawfirm.com
cyoung@saverilawfirm.com
10 hbenon@saverilawfirm.com
acera@saverilawfirm.com
mpoueymirou@saverilawfirm.com

11 Matthew Butterick (State Bar No. 250953)
12 1920 Hillhurst Avenue, 406
13 Los Angeles, CA 90027
Telephone: (323)968-2632
14 Facsimile: (415) 395-9940
Email: mb@buttericklaw.com

15 Bryan L. Clobes (pro hac vice)
16 Alexander J. Sweatman (pro hac vice)
Mohammed A. Rathur (pro hac vice)
17 **CAFFERTY CLOBES MERIWETHER**
& SPRENGEL LLP
18 135 South LaSalle Street, Suite 3210
Chicago, IL 60603
19 Telephone: (312) 782-4880
Email: bclobes@caffertyclobes.com
20 asweatman@caffertyclobes.com
mrathur@caffertyclobes.com

21 Daniel J. Muller (State Bar No. 193396)
22 **VENTURA HERSEY & MULLER, LLP**
1506 Hamilton Avenue
23 San Jose, California 95125
Telephone: (408) 512-3022
24 Facsimile: (408) 512-3023
Email: dmuller@venturahersey.com

25 *Counsel for Individual and Representative Plaintiffs*
26 *and the Proposed Class*
27
28